



Proceedings of the 66th ANNUAL CONVENTION

NCAA

HOLLYWOOD, FLORIDA / JANUARY 6-8, 1972

1972 NCAA CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

Proceedings
of the
**66th Annual
Convention**
of the
**National Collegiate
Athletic Association**

**Diplomat Hotel
Hollywood, Florida
January 6-8, 1972**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Register, 1972

Administrative Organization	5
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working News Media	9
Proceedings of the 66th Annual Convention	
Delegates Orientation Session	20
Opening Business Session	
1. Opening Remarks	29
2. Explanation of Voting Procedures	32
3. Further Explanations by the President	32
4. Report of the Secretary-Treasurer	33
5. Report of the Executive Committee	35
6. Report of the Council	37
7. Report of the Committee on Memorial Resolutions	39
8. Additional Business	40
Faculty Representatives-Athletic Directors Round Table	41
University Division Round Table	68
College Division Round Table	87
Honors Luncheon	111
Continuance of Business Session	
9. Report of the Television Committee	130
10. Proposed Amendments	
Revision of the Agenda	131
Special Convention	133
Advertising	137
Financial Aid	137
Awards	138
Undergraduate Eligibility	138
Postgraduate Eligibility	138
Individual Eligibility	139
Five-Year Rule, Transfer Rule	139
Summer Basketball	140
Individual Eligibility	142
Sports Camps	142
Coaching Schools	144
Campus Visitations	144
Transportation	149



Kansas City, Missouri 64105

August 1972

Entertainment	149
Off-Campus Visitations	150
Representative of Athletic Interests	158
Representative Schedule	158
Membership Classes	159
Postseason Football Contests	160
College All-Star Contests	161
Basketball Playing Season	161
Postseason Basketball Tournaments	162
Individual Eligibility	162
Freshman Rule	163
1.600 Rule	166
Coaching Schools	178
Transfer Rule	179
Alien Student-Athletes	180
Ice Hockey Eligibility	182
Off-Campus Visitation	182
Waivers	183
Transfers of Membership	183
Committees	183
National College Division Soccer Championship	184
Officiating	184
Tryout Rule	184
Transfer Rule	184
Football Open Dates	185
Football Season	185
Administration of Aid	185
11. Other Proposals	
Revisions of Executive Regulations	186
Enforcement Procedure	187
Basketball Television	187
Transfer Rule	188
Official Interpretations	189
12. Report of the Committee on Committees	190
13. Report of the Nominating Committee	190
III. Appendices	
Appendix A: Proposed Amendments and Other Proposals	A- 1
Appendix B: Amendments to Amendments	A-33
Appendix C: Convention Committees	A-38
Appendix D: Past and Present Officers of the NCAA	A-40
Appendix E: NCAA Convention Sites, 1944-1974	A-41

1972 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

NCAA Officers

President

EARL M. RAMER

Professor of Education—13 Henson Hall
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn. 37916

Secretary-Treasurer

SAMUEL E. BARNES, *Professor Health and Physical Education*
District of Columbia Teachers College, Washington D. C. 20009

Executive Director

WALTER BYERS, 1221 Baltimore Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri 64105

The Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chairman and secretary, respectively. Nine members of the Council are the eight district vice-presidents and the vice-president-at-large, each of whom is elected for two years and may be immediately reelected for one additional term. Seven members are elected at-large for terms of three years and may not be reelected until three years have elapsed.

Term Expires

District 1 Vice-President—Robert W. Pritchard Jan. 1974
Head, Department of Physical Education and Athletics
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, Mass. 01609

District 2 Vice-President—Ernest C. Casale Jan. 1973
Director of Athletics
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

District 3 Vice-President—Ralph E. Fadum Jan. 1974
Dean of Engineering, 229 Riddick Bldg., Box 5518
North Carolina State University, Raleigh, N.C. 27607

District 4 Vice-President—John A. Fuzak Jan. 1973
Associate Dean and Director, School for Advanced Studies,
College of Education
Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823

District 5 Vice-President—Wade R. Stinson Jan. 1974
Director of Athletics
University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044

District 6 Vice-President—Alan J. Chapman Jan. 1973
Professor of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Box 1892, Rice University, Houston, Texas 77001

1972 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

The Council (Continued)

District 7 Vice-President—Louis A. Myers Jan. 1974
Professor of Accounting, College of Business and
Public Administration
University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721

District 8 Vice-President—George F. Ilg Jan. 1973
Assistant Dean, School of Agricultural Sciences
Fresno State College, Fresno, California 93710

Vice-President-at-Large—Richard P. Koenig Jan. 1974
Vice-President, Public and Alumni Affairs
Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Indiana 46383

Member-at-Large—Harry M. Cross Jan. 1974
Professor of Law
University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195

Member-at-Large—J. William Davis Jan. 1974
Professor of Government
Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409

Member-at-Large—William Exum Jan. 1975
Chairman, Department of Health, Physical Education and Athletics
Kentucky State College, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Member-at-Large—Howard C. Gentry Jan. 1974
Professor of Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Tennessee State University, Nashville, Tenn. 37203

Member-at-Large—Walter L. Hass Jan. 1975
Chairman, Department of Physical Education
University of Chicago
5640 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637

Member-at-Large—Adolph W. Samborski Jan. 1973
Commissioner, Yankee Conference
New England Center Administration Building
15 Garrison Avenue
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

Member-at-Large—David Swank Jan. 1975
Professor of Law and Director of Legal Internship
University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73069

1972 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

Executive Committee

The NCAA president, vice-president-at-large and secretary-treasurer shall be *ex officio* members of the Executive Committee. The remaining seven members of the Committee are elected by the Council for a period of one year. At least one new member shall be elected each year. Date of first election is shown in parentheses.

Stan Bates (Jan. 1970)
Commissioner, Western Athletic Conference
1515 Cleveland Place, Denver, Colorado 80202

A. M. Coleman (Jan. 1971)
Commissioner, Southeastern Conference
1214 Central Bank Bldg., Birmingham, Alabama 35233

Wayne Duke (April 1969)
Commissioner, Big Ten Conference
505 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60611

William J. Flynn (Jan. 1971)
Director of Athletics
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167

Marcus L. Plant (Jan. 1969)
Professor of Law, 332 Hutchins Hall
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Polk F. Robison (Jan. 1970)
Athletic Administrator of Finance and Development
Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409

Marshall S. Turner Jr. (Jan. 1972)
Director of Athletics
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Executive Office

Walter Byers, *Executive Director*
Arthur J. Bergstrom, *Controller*
Warren S. Brown, *Assistant Executive Director*
Thomas C. Hansen, *Assistant Executive Director*
Louis J. Spry, *Assistant Executive Director*

David Berst, *Executive Assistant*
Thomas C. Combs, *Events Manager*
Marjorie Fieber, *Business Manager*
Grayle W. Howlett, *Promotion Director*
Nordy Jensen, *NCAA News Editor*
Ralph McFillen, *Executive Assistant*
Jerry Miles, *Director of Public Relations*
Ted C. Tow, *Director of Publications*
Fannie Vaughan, *Administrative Assistant*
Shirley Whitacre, *Administrative Assistant*
James H. Wilkinson, *Director of Sports Development*

THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
Midland Building, 1221 Baltimore Avenue
Kansas City, Missouri 64105
Area Code 816; Phone 474-4600

1972 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

Service Bureau

Larry Klein, *Director*
Jack Waters, *Assistant Director*
Jim Van Valkenburg, *Assistant Director*
Steve Boda, *Research*
Chris Erles, *Compilations*
Jerry Klein, *Compilations*
Ron Schwartz, *News Film*

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE SPORTS SERVICES
420 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017
Area Code 212; Phone 685-9622

The Service Bureau collects, compiles and distributes the official statistics of college football, basketball and baseball and performs other services commonly associated with a sports information and promotional agency.

Publishing Service

Homer F. Cooke, Jr., *Director*
Marie Montana, *Assistant Director*
Jonathan Clark, *General Editor*
Wallace Renfro, *Publications Editor*
Geraldine Paul, *Circulation Manager*

COLLEGE ATHLETICS PUBLISHING SERVICE
349 East Thomas Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
Area Code 602; Phone 264-5656

The Service publishes the official guides, rule books and scorebooks of the Association

Film Service

Richard S. Snider, *Director*
NCAA OFFICIAL FILMS
P.O. Box 2726
Wichita, Kansas 67201
Area Code 316; Phone 267-2828

The Service produces and maintains the official films of the Association

SIXTY-SIXTH ANNUAL CONVENTION DELEGATES AND VISITORS

Active Member Institutions

District One

American International College: Milton J. Piepul
Amherst College: Benjamin F. McCabe
Assumption College: Andrew Laska
Bates College: Lloyd H. Lux
Bentley College: Elwood N. Shields
Boston State College: James P. Sullivan
Boston University: Charles Luce, Warren H. P. Schmakel
Bowdoin College: Edmund L. Coombs
Brandeis University: Nicholas Rodis
Bridgeport, University of: Herbert E. Glines
Bridgewater State College: Harry A. Lehmann
Brown University: F. A. Geiger
Bryant College: Thomas J. Folliard
Central Connecticut State College: Lowell D. Lukas
Clark University: Russ Granger
Colby College: John W. Winkin
Connecticut, University of: John L. Toner
Dartmouth College: Seaver Peters
Fairfield University: C. Donald Cook
Hartford, University of: Roger A. Wickman
Harvard University: Robert B. Watson
Holy Cross College: Vincent G. Dougherty
Lowell State College: James Ciszek
Lowell Technological Institute: W. W. Yarnall
Maine, University of, Orono: Harold S. Westerman
Massachusetts, University of: Robert W. O'Connell, George R. Richardson
Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Ross H. Smith
Middlebury College: Richard W. Colman Jr.
New Hampshire, University of: Andrew Mooradian
New Haven, University of: Donald R. Ormrod
Nichols College: Hal Chalmers
North Adams State College: Joseph Zavattaro
Northeastern University: Herbert W. Gallagher, Joseph P. Zabilski
Norwich University: Robert B. Priestley
Plymouth State College: Paul E. Arold
Providence College: J. Vincent Cuddy
Rhode Island, University of: Ernie Calverley, Maurice Zarchen
Rhode Island College: William M. Baird
Salem State College: Richard L. Schneider
Southern Connecticut State College: Anthony Martone
Springfield College: Edward S. Steitz
Trinity College: Karl Kurth Jr.

Tufts University: Harry Arlanson
U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Otto Graham
Vermont, University of: J. Edward Donnelly
Wesleyan University: Norman J. Daniels, Donald M. Russell
Westfield State College: F. Paul Bogan
Williams College: Robert R. Peck
Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Robert W. Pritchard
Worcester State College: Robert A. Devlin, Robert E. Leestamper
Yale University: James E. Holgate, DeLaney Kiphuth

District Two

Adelphi University: James Bedell
Albany, State University of New York: J. Ralph Tibbets, Alfred C. Werner
Alfred University: Paul F. Powers
American University: Robert H. Frailey
Binghamton, State University of New York: David C. Henderson
Brooklyn College: Charles Tobey
Bucknell University: Robert A. Latour
Buffalo State University College: Howard B. MacAdam, Thomas J. Quattroche
Buffalo, State University of New York: Robert C. Demming, Peter Field, Harry Fritz
C. W. Post College: William T. Lai
California State College: Paul E. Ross
Cheyney State College: Edwin W. Lawrence
Clarion State College: Frank Lignelli
Clarkson College: John J. Hantz
Colgate University: Harold W. Lahar
Columbia University: Kenneth G. Germann
Cornell University: Robert J. Kane
Cortland, State University College: Francis J. Woods
Delaware, University of: Scotty Duncan, David M. Nelson
Delaware State College: James H. Williams
Delaware Valley College: Ned A. Linta
Dickinson College: David B. Eavenson
District of Columbia Teachers College: Samuel E. Barnes, Ralph J. Matera
Drexel University: John Semanik
Duquesne University: Paul H. Anderson, Clair N. Brown
East Stroudsburg State College: John R. Eiler
Elizabethtown College: John M. Tulley
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: Robert T. Shields
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: George Manfredi, Harvey D. Woods
Franklin and Marshall College: William A. Marshall
Gannon College: Howard Elwell
Geneseo, State University College: Robert F. Riedel
George Washington University: Edward A. Caress, Robert K. Faris
Georgetown University: Robert L. Hoggson
Gettysburg College: Eugene M. Haas
Glassboro State College: D. Michael Briglia, Maurice G. Verbeke
Hamilton College: Mox A. Weber

Hampton Institute: Herman N. Neilson, Robert M. Screen
Haverford College: Dana Swan
Herbert H. Lehman College: Michael M. Fleischer
Hofstra University: P. Dalebrook, Philip R. Theibert
Howard University: Leo F. Miles
Indiana University: Herman L. Sledzik, Samuel G. Smith
Ithaca College: Carlton Wood
Juniata College: Walter Nadzak Jr.
Lafayette College: Olav B. Kollevoll
LaSalle College: John J. Conboy, Robert J. Courtney
Lehigh University: William B. Leckonby
LeMoyne College: Thomas J. Niland Jr.
Long Island University: Jerry Donner
Lycoming College: David G. Busey
Manhattan College: Kenneth A. Norton
Millersville State College: Lawrence A. McDermott
Montclair State College: William P. Dioguardi
Morgan State College: Embra C. Bowie, Earl O. Embree, Talmadge L. Hill
Muhlenberg College: Raymond J. Whispell
New York, City College of: Robert M. Behrman
New York University: Bernard L. Carnevale, Hugo M. Castello, Miguel DeCapriles, Daniel Quilty
Oswego, State University College: John V. Glinski
PMC Colleges: George A. Hansell
Pace College: Peter X. Finnerty
Pennsylvania, University of: Fred A. Shabel
Pennsylvania State University: John J. Coyle, Edward M. Czekaj, Robert J. Scannell, James I. Tarman
Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science: Harry Pure
Pittsburgh, University of: Frank Carver, Walter Cummins, Paul H. Masoner, Casimir J. Myslinski
Princeton University: R. Kenneth Fairman
Queens College: Robert J. Tierney
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert Ducatte, Edward Jucker
Rider College: John B. Carpenter
Rutgers University: Frederick E. Gruninger, Albert W. Twitchell
St. Francis College: Roger Nagle
St. John's University: Walter T. McLaughlin
St. Lawrence University: Thomas A. Cartmill
St. Peter's College: John A. Boland
Seton Hall University: John J. Horgan
Slippery Rock State College: William C. Meise, Robert E. Raymond
Syracuse University: James H. Decker, Ronald Oyer
Temple University: Ernest C. Casale
Union College: R. Bruce Allison, William Ketz
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: James W. Liebertz
U.S. Military Academy: J. R. Jannarone, William J. Schuder
U.S. Naval Academy: J. O. Coppedge
Ursinus College: Everett M. Bailey
Villanova University: Arthur L. Mahan
Wagner College: Herbert E. Sutter
West Chester State College: Robert W. Reese

West Virginia University: Robert N. Brown, Ruel E. Foster
Westminster College: Harold E. Burry

District Three

Alabama, University of: Sam D. Bailey, Jefferson J. Coleman, Willard F. Gray
Alabama A&M University: George H. Hobson
Alabama State University: C. Johnson Dunn
Appalachian State University: Roy B. Clogston, James F. Jones
Auburn University: Charles F. Simmons
Austin Peay State University: David B. Aaron, Leon Bibb
Baptist College: William Howard Bagwell
Bowie State College: A. C. Jordan
Catholic University: J. Brian McCall
Citadel: Donald C. Birch, John E. Burrows, D. S. McAlister, Edward L. Teague
Clemson University: H. C. McLellan, Kenneth N. Vickery
Davidson College: Tom Scott
Delta State College: Horace L. McCool
Duke University: Edward Cameron, Robert L. Dickens, Carl James
East Carolina University: Douglas R. Jones, Clarence Stasavich
East Tennessee State University: John Robert Bell, Solon Gentry
Eastern Kentucky University: Donald G. Combs
Emory University: William Clyde Partin
Fayetteville State University: William M. Bell
Fisk University: Herbert B. Thompson
Florida A&M University: Samuel Washington Jr.
Florida Southern College: Thomas H. Greene
Florida, University of: Mandell Glicksburg, Ray Graves
Florida State University: Richard M. Baker Jr., G. Clayton Stapleton
Furman University: J. Lyles Alley, Francis W. Bonner
Gallaudet College: Peter R. Wisher
Georgia Institute of Technology: Fred L. Allman, J. W. Mason, John McKenna
Georgia Southern College: James I. Clements Jr.
Georgia, University of: Joel Eaves, H. Boyd McWhorter
Hampden-Sydney College: J. Stokeley Fulton
Jacksonville University: Judson B. Harris Jr.
Johns Hopkins University: Marshall S. Turner Jr.
Kentucky, University of: Harry C. Lancaster, William L. Matthews Jr.
Kentucky State College: Henry E. Cheaney, William Exum
Knoxville College: Julian Bell
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute: Maxie T. Lambright, Harold J. Smolinski
Maryland, University of, Baltimore: E. Richard Watts Jr.
Maryland, University of, College Park: John E. Faber, James H. Kehoe Jr.
Maryville College: William H. Dent
McNeese State University: Jack V. Doland, Louis P. Reily
Memphis State University: Ford Haynes Jr., C. C. Humphreys, Billy J. Murphy, R. P. Murray
Miami, University of: Peter Elliott, Henry C. Mallios, Ernest B. McCoy
Middle Tennessee State University: Charles M. Murphy

Millsaps College: Harper Davis, James A. Montgomery
Mississippi, University of: T. A. Bickerstaff, Porter L. Fortune Jr., John R. Holley, Richard E. Keye, Frank M. Kinard
Mississippi State University: James K. Jones, Charles N. Shira
Mississippi Valley State College: Silas Peyton, Davis Weathersby
Morehead State University: Robert Laughlin
Morehouse College: Arthur J. McAfee Jr.
Morris Brown College: Major J. Powell Jr.
Nicholls State University: Raymond E. Didier
North Carolina A&T State University: Artis P. Graves
North Carolina Central University: James W. Younge
North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: William W. Cobey Jr., E. M. Hedgpeth, Homer C. Rice
North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: William J. Brooks
North Carolina State University: Willis Casey, Ralph Fadum, Frank Weedon
Northeast Louisiana University: Marcus B. Mapp
Old Dominion University: James Jarrett, Warren Matthews
Richmond, University of: E. Sherman Grable, B. Frank Jones
Roanoke College: Thomas J. Martin
Rollins College: Joseph Justice
Samford University: H. Evan Zeiger
South, University of the: Walter D. Bryant Jr.
South Alabama, University of: Melvin A. Lucas
South Carolina, University of: Weems O. Baskin Jr., Paul F. Dietzel, Racon Floyd, Harold B. Hagan, William F. Putnam
South Florida, University of: Richard T. Bowers, Donn L. Smith
Southeastern Louisiana University: Robert C. Brown, Patrick G. Kenelly
Southern Mississippi, University of: Bernard Reed Green, William N. Henderson
Southwestern College: William R. Maybry
Southwestern Louisiana, University of: David H. Fisher, A. G. Urban
Stillman College: Jesse Hosey
Tampa, University of: A. J. Dielens Jr.
Tennessee, University of, Chattanooga: Harold B. Wilkes
Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Edward J. Boling, Earl M. Ramer, George R. Woodruff
Tennessee State University: Howard C. Gentry, Crawford B. Lindsay
Tennessee Technological University: R. Hooper Eblen
Tougaloo College: James C. Coleman
Towson State College: Thomas O. Meinhardt
Tulane University: Harvey Jessup, Hugh F. Rankin, Rix N. Yard
Tuskegee Institute: H. Frank Leftwich Jr.
Vanderbilt University: Rob Roy Purdy
Virginia Military Institute: John G. Barrett, Tom Joynes
Virginia Polytechnic Institute: Wilson B. Bell, W. B. Matthews
Virginia, University of: Eugene F. Corrigan, D. Alan Williams
Virginia State College: William M. Bennett
Wake Forest University: John W. Sawyer
Washington College: Edward L. Athey
Washington and Lee University: William D. McHenry
Western Kentucky University: Jim Feix

William and Mary, College of: H. Lester Hooker Jr.

District Four

Akron, University of: Gordon K. Larson, Kenneth MacDonald
Ashland College: Robert Stokes, Robert Wendling
Baldwin-Wallace College: Lee J. Tressel
Ball State University: Philip E. Ballou, Raymond A. Louthen,
John E. Reno
Beloit College: Robert G. Nicholls
Bowling Green State University: Carl W. Hallberg, Richard A. Young
Butler University: Tom M. Warner
Case Western Reserve University: Philip K. Heim
Central Michigan University: Ted Kjolhede, Daniel P. Rose,
Lester Serier
Central Ohio State University: George Jurcisin
Chicago, University of: Walter L. Hass, George Oberle
Cincinnati, University of: William R. Nester, George D. Smith
Dayton, University of: Thomas J. Frericks, Jim Hoover
Denison University: LeRoy G. Seils
DePauw University: Robert D. Loring, James Loveless
Eastern Illinois University: Tom Katsimpalis, Peter Moody
Eastern Michigan University: F. L. Ferzacca, George W. Linn
Hope College: Gordon M. Brewer
Illinois, University of, Champaign: H. Sheldon Stillwell, Gene Vance
Illinois, University of, Chicago Circle: Edward L. Deam,
Walter G. Versen
Illinois State University: Warren S. Perry, Milton E. Weisbecker
Indiana Central College: Robert M. Brooker
Indiana State University: Gordon H. Chalmers, Woody S. Suttle
Indiana University: Edwin H. Cady, J. William Orwig
Iowa, University of: Chalmers W. Elliott, Robert F. Ray, George Wine
Kent State University: Milo R. Lude
Lake Forest College: Nick Wasyluk
MacMurray College: William L. Wall
Marietta College: Joe W. McDaniel
Marquette University: Samuel P. Sauceda
Marshall University: Joseph H. McMullen, Harold L. Willey
Miami University: Fred Cottrell, Richard G. Shrider
Michigan, University of: Donald B. Canham, Donald Lund,
Marcus L. Plant.
Michigan State University: John A. Fuzak, J. Burt Smith
Michigan Technological Institute: Kenzie Ross Johnson
Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Ralph A. Romano
Minnesota, University of, Minneapolis: Glen A. Reed, Marsh Ryman,
Max O. Schultz
Mount Union College: Jackson W. Rafeld
Muskingum College: Edgar A. Sherman
Northern Illinois University: Robert J. Brigham, Nye Labaw,
Clyde C. Walton
Northern Michigan University: Gil Canale, Henry Heimonen
Northwestern University: Waldo A. Fisher
Notre Dame, University of: Michael A. DeCicco, Edward W. Krause,
Edmund Joyce, John J. Stephens

Oberlin College: William Grice

Ohio Northern University: Marvin V. English

Ohio State University: Roy A. Larmee, Hugh D. Hindman, J. Edward
Weaver

Ohio University: Fred Picard, William D. Rohr

Ohio Wesleyan University: Robert M. Strimer

Otterbein College: Robert Agler

Purdue University: Ray Eddy, Roy L. Whistler

St. Joseph's College: Richard F. Scharf

Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: William Brown

Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Harry J. Gallatin, Ramon
Williamson

Toledo, University of: Edwin L. Saxon, Vernon M. Smith

Valparaiso University: Emory G. Bauer, Richard Koenig

Wabash College: Max E. Servies

Wayne State University: Vernon K. Gale, Chalmer G. Hixson, James
B. Tintera

Western Illinois University: John Colgate, Gil Peterson

Western Michigan University: Joseph T. Hoy, Leo C. VanderBeek

Wheaton College: Harvey C. Chrouser

Winona State College: John Kane

Wisconsin, University of: Elroy L. Hirsch, Frank J. Remington

Wittenberg University: William M. Edwards

Xavier University: James M. Cafferty, Jack Cherry

District Five

Augustana College: A. L. Sponberg

Bradley University: A. G. Haussler, Orville Nothdurft, Charles
Orsborn

Central Missouri State College: Floyd Walker

Colorado, University of: William H. Baughn, Fred Casotti, Edwin B.
Crowder

Cornell College: William A. Deskin

Creighton University: Michael P. Sheridan

Drake University: Leland Johnson, Robert D. Karnes, Stuart C.
Tiedeman

Iowa State University: John P. Mahlstede, Louis G. McCullough

Kansas, University of: Charles H. Oldfather Jr., Wade R. Stinson

Kansas State University: Ernie D. Barrett, C. Clyde Jones

Lincoln University: Dwight T. Reed

Louisville, University of: Carl E. Abner

Mankato State College: James Otto

Missouri, University of, Columbia: Arthur W. Neber, Wilbur Stalcup

Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Lawrence D. Friedman

Morningside College: R. D. Halford

Nebraska, University of: Don Bryant, Keith L. Broman, James S.
Pittenger

North Dakota, University of: Leonard R. Marti

North Dakota State University: Ronald P. Erhardt

North Texas State University: James L. Rogers, Rod Rust

Northeast Missouri State College: John D. Black, James J. Dougherty

Northern Iowa, University of: Stan Sheriff

Oklahoma, University of: David Swank, Wade H. Walker

Oklahoma State University: Raymond E. Chapel, D. L. Cooper, Floyd Gass
Oral Roberts University: Dwayne E. Roe, Jack P. Wallace
Parsons College: John Wahrer
St. Louis University: Lawrence K. Albus, Jerome J. Marchetti
South Dakota, University of: Carl R. Miller
South Dakota State University: Stanley J. Marshall
Southwest Missouri State College: Aldo Sebben
Tulsa, University of: John P. Dratz, F. A. Dry
Washington University: Richard D. Martin
Wichita State University: Cecil N. Coleman, Robert M. Holmer

District Six

Abilene Christian College: Wally Bullington
Alcorn A&M College: Marino H. Casem, Norris A. Edney
Arkansas, University of: Frank Broyles, George R. Cole, John E. Kane
Arkansas AM&N College: Vannette W. Johnson
Arkansas State University: Don S. Floyd, Sam R. Gennuso
Baylor University: Edwin P. Horner, Jack Patterson
Centenary College: Robert Deufel, Orvis U. Sigler
Grambling College: C. D. Henry, Edward G. Robinson
Houston, University of: Harry H. Fouke, A. A. White
Houston Baptist College: Ed S. Billings, William B. Crittenden
Jackson State College: Martin L. Epps
Lamar University: James B. Higgins Jr.
Pan American University: James A. Brooks, John W. Hook
Rice University: Alan J. Chapman
Southern Methodist University: Hayden Fry, Harold Jeskey
Southern University: Ulysses S. Jones Sr.
Texas, University of, Arlington: Claude R. Gilstrap
Texas, University of, Austin: Jones Ramsey, Darrell K. Royal, J. Neils Thompson
Texas A&M University: Charles H. Samson Jr.
Texas Christian University: Kenneth Herrick, Abe Martin
Texas Southern University: Roderick Paige
Texas Technological University: Richard B. Amandes, J. William Davis, J. T. King, T. L. Leach, Polk Robison
West Texas State University: L. Jack Edmondson, Gene Mayfield

District Seven

Arizona, University of: M. R. Clausen, Richard M. Edwards, Dale Foster, Louis Myers, Frank W. Soltys
Arizona State University: Fred L. Miller, Clyde B. Smith, Alfred Thomas Jr.
Boise State College: Dale Blickenstaff, Lyle H. Smith
Brigham Young University: Milton F. Hartvigsen, Glen Tuckett
Colorado School of Mines: William E. Leckie, Francis E. Smiley
Colorado State University: Perry C. Moore, Harry E. Troxell
Idaho, University of: Roland O. Byers, Edward T. Knecht
Idaho State University: Darold H. Chambers, William W. Holt
Montana, University of: Earl C. Lory
Montana State University: Tom Parac
New Mexico, University of: Joe E. Martinez, Pete McDavid

New Mexico State University: Keith Colson, Carl R. Hall
Northern Arizona University: Norman B. Johansen, Lyle L. Mullens
Northern Colorado, University of: Donald Chaloupka, Virgil Lindahl
Regis College: Clarence H. Kellogg
Texas, University of, El Paso: Richard W. Burns, George C. McCarty
U. S. Air Force Academy: Anthony R. Cillo, Philip J. Erdle, Frank E. Merritt, Reuben Ramsey, Jack Schwall
Utah, University of: James R. Jack
Utah State University: Norman B. Jones, Frank R. Williams
Weber State College: Dale L. Gardner, Milton C. Mecham
Wyoming, University of: Glenn J. Jacoby, Harold Rollins, William Young

District Eight

California, University of, Berkeley: Arleigh Williams, Robley C. Williams
California, University of, Davis: Hubert H. Heitman, Joe L. Singleton
California, University of, Los Angeles: Thomas L. Jacobs, J. D. Morgan
California, University of, Riverside: Franklin A. Lindeburg
California, University of, Santa Barbara: Ed Swartz
California State College, Fullerton: John E. Caine
California State College, Long Beach: Clarence R. Bergland, James L. Comer, K. E. North
California State College, Los Angeles: John Hermann
California State Polytechnic Institute: R. Joe Harper, Robert J. Healey, Don Warhurst
Chico State College: Rex R. Grossart
Fresno State College: J. Gene Bourdet, George F. Ilg
Hawaii, University of: Paul Durham
Humboldt State College: Larry W. Kerker
Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Michael Drakulich, Dallas W. Norton
Nevada, University of, Reno: Richard Trachok
Oregon, University of: Norval Ritchey
Oregon State University: Kline R. Swygard
Pacific, University of the: Cedric W. Dempsey
Pepperdine University: Wayne Wright
Pomona College: Edward W. Malan
Redlands, University of: Lee Fulmer
Sacramento State College: Donald E. Fuoss
St. Mary's College: Don J. McKillip
San Diego State College: O. Kenneth Karr
San Fernando Valley State College: Glen W. Arnett, Arthur T. Taitt, Sam Winningham
San Jose State College: Robert Bronzan, James W. Scheel
Santa Clara University: George P. Malley
Southern California, University of: E. John Larsen, Virgil G. Lubberden, Tom Nickell
Stanford University: F. L. Behling, John W. Harbaugh, Charles A. Taylor, Robert G. Young
Washington, University of: Harry M. Cross, Joe L. Kearney
Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Ray Nagel

Associate Members

Allen University: Thomas B. Nelson
Florida Atlantic University: Robert L. Breitenstein
Pittsburgh, University of, Johnstown: C. Edward Sherlock, George R. Walter
Valdosta State College: Jay Arnold, William Grant
Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Dean A. Austin

Allied Members

Atlantic Coast Conference: Robert C. James, Norvall Neve
Big Eight Conference: Charles M. Neinas, John Waldorf
Big Sky Conference: John O. Roning
Big Ten Conference: John D. Dewey, Wayne Duke
California Collegiate Athletic Association: M. Edward Wagner
Central Collegiate Conference: Robert D. Karnes
College Athletic Conference: Richard Martin
Eastern College Athletic Conference: George L. Shiebler, Robert M. Whitelaw
Eastern Intercollegiate Gymnastics League: Ernest C. Casale
Eastern Intercollegiate Wrestling Association: George L. Shiebler
Far Western Conference: Everett F. Shelton
Gulf South Conference: Stanley Galloway
Indiana Collegiate Conference: John J. Hinga
Ivy Group: Leonard DeFiore
Mid-American Conference: Fred Jacoby
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: LeRoy T. Walker
Middle Atlantic Conference: Marshall S. Turner Jr.
Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference: William A. Deskin
Midwestern Conference: Jack McClelland
Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Roy F. Brown
Missouri Valley Conference: DeWitt T. Weaver
New England Collegiate Athletic Conference: Herbert W. Gallagher
North Central Conference: Richard G. Koppenhaver
Ohio Athletic Conference: Albert N. Smith
Ohio Valley Conference: Arthur L. Guepe
Pacific Coast Athletic Association: Cameron S. Deeds, Jesse T. Hill, George F. Ilg
Pacific-8 Conference: Wiles Hallock
Southeastern Conference: A. M. Coleman, Cliff Harper
Southern Conference: Lloyd P. Jordan, J. Dallas Shirley
Southland Conference: Dick Oliver
Southwest Athletic Conference: Wilbur Evans, Howard Grubbs, Cliff Speagle
Southwestern Athletic Conference: Charles D. Henry
West Coast Athletic Conference: Wilfred H. Crowley, Walter Hawkins
Western Athletic Conference: Stan Bates, David Price
Yankee Conference: Adolph W. Samborski

Affiliated Members

Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association: Stan Drobac
National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: Jimmie McDowell, George L. Murphy

Visitors

American Association of College Registrars and Admissions Officers: T. Sherman Stanford
Bernard M. Baruch College: Lou Brown, Al Peredo
Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union: Carl Totzke, Bob Pugh
C. D. Chesley Company: C. D. Chesley
Cotton Bowl: Field Scovell
Deering High School: Gordon R. Pendleton
East Montana College: Frank H. Specalski
Football Publications: Charlie Thorp
Gator Bowl Association: George R. Olsen
Hughes Sports Network: H. B. Lee
Liberty Bowl: Bud Dudley
National Association of College Directors of Athletics: Michael Cleary
NCAA TV Committee: Asa S. Bushnell
New Orleans Mid-Winter Sports Association: Paul DeBlanc, Bernie Grenrood, Cliff Kern, Theodore Maumus, Wynne Stouse, Charles Zatarain
Pasadena Tournament of Roses Association: Raymond Dorn, Stanley Hahn, Lathrop Leishman, William H. Nicholas, Virgil White
Richard Hawley Cutting and Associates: Richard H. Cutting
Spencer Marketing Services: John F. Geis
Sun Bowl: Harrison Kohl
TVS Television Network: Eddie Einhorn, Alan Lubell
Wisconsin State University Conference: Max R. Sparger
Marty Baldwin, East Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania
Mike Toney, Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Working News Media

ABC-TV, Miami: George Faulder
Arizona Daily Star: Tom Foust
Associated Press: Herschel Nissenson
Atlanta Journal: Darrell Simmons
Boston Globe: Joe Concannon, Nate Greenberg
CBS-TV, Miami: Jane Chastain, Bill Gallagher
Chronicle of Higher Education: Bill Sievert
Fort Lauderdale News: Dave Heeren
Hollywood Sun-Tattler: Wayne Segall
Kansas City Star: Bill Sims
Miami Herald: Luther Evans
Nashville Banner: Fred Russell
NBC-TV, Miami: Al Gordon
New York Times: Gordon White
Oklahoman: Volney Meece
Salt Lake City Tribune: John Mooney
Tucson Daily Citizen: Regis McCauley
United Press International: Les Kjos

DELEGATES ORIENTATION SESSION

Thursday, January 6, 1972

The first session of the Sixty-Sixth Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened in the Convention Hall of The Diplomat Hotel, Hollywood, Florida, at 8:40 a.m., Earl M. Ramer, professor of education, University of Tennessee, and President of the Association, presiding.

President Ramer: Welcome to the Sixty-Sixth Annual Convention, and welcome especially to those who are here for the first time. We hope the remarks that we will be making this morning may be of some benefit to you. We hope that you will stay a few minutes toward the end so you may raise questions or make comments.

Our purpose in this orientation session is to present material that will be relatively new to those who have not been with us before; material which will not be covered again in the Opening Session. Matters concerning voting procedures, the nature of amendments during the sessions of the Convention and general announcements pertaining to this Convention will not be touched upon during this session.

Gentlemen, I think that those who have participated in the work of this Association over a period of years join me in the feeling that we have a great organization. It has become a large and complex organization, but that largeness and that complexity reflect the largeness and complexity of our society, and in the development of that largeness and complexity we are really reflecting in our organization the kind of problems that we face in our society. That is good.

I think personally it is a great organization. Some of the happiest professional experiences I have had during the past ten years have been in association with my work with this group and the good fortune I have had in making new friends and forming friendships of a lasting nature. I am grateful personally for that opportunity.

I say the organization is large and complex. It is indeed. We have now more than 700 member institutions and agencies involved. We are facing problems of complex character; problems we didn't seem to face or need to face ten or fifteen years ago.

You have noted our agenda for the Business Session, which is 50 per cent larger than any agenda in the past, numerically speaking at least. I could add that the increase in the number of items being considered can probably be matched proportionately by the interest and controversy involved in all of them.

So these decisions are important. Many of them are going to be difficult, but I know that you will share with me both the interest and the stimulation in facing these issues that somehow must seek resolution.

In all of the complexities that face us—all the difficulties that we sense as we face our agenda, seeking accommodation of these matters to the interest of our several institutions; institutions varying in size, varying in character—we sometimes get lost in the detail. The

statistics loom larger, I suspect, than they should, and we are prone to forget the central purpose of this. In the opening remarks at this time I want to emphasize that central purpose.

As I have read our Constitution and Bylaws, I have sensed only one statement of that purpose that is alluring and that I like to come back to when I am facing these complicated matters of one type and another. I like to sit back and say to myself, the real purpose is educational. That is what we are seeking. We are attempting to bring athletic programs, and keep athletic programs, in proper alignment with the educational purposes of our institutions. That means every single force or endeavor must contribute to that purpose, and if the time comes when you and I as faculty representatives feel that our athletic programs are not consistent with the educational purposes of the institutions we represent, then two choices become necessary: To seek to bring our activities into proper alignment with those educational purposes, or to get out of the business.

I have a feeling, and I hope it is not a naive feeling, that most of you agree with this point of view. I am thinking now of faculty representatives, university administrators, directors of athletics, coaches. Those of us who are participating in this great organization I feel are committed to educational soundness for intercollegiate athletics.

So as we in this Convention, in our business session, face these statistical problems, problems of all types, difficult problems, I hope you will join me in remembering this is nothing more than your effort and mine to bring our activities in this Association and our activities on our several campuses into proper alignment with the educational purposes we serve, and to keep that alignment through the years.

Gentlemen, we are happy this morning to present three senior members of our Kansas City office staff, who really carry the will of this Association into action on many fronts.

I am going to ask Arthur Bergstrom, our controller, to discuss with us the finances of our organization, some of the decisions concerning staff and the manner in which our career staff works toward implementation of the policies and procedures that you and I have provided for them.

Arthur J. Bergstrom (Controller, NCAA): Mr. President and Gentlemen: you know the legislation of this Association is enacted only through a vote by the membership at the time of this annual Convention, and once that is done, it becomes the duty and the responsibility of the Executive Office in Kansas City to carry out and administer the directives of the membership.

The executive staff at the home office in Kansas City has increased over the past several years, and it has become necessary to departmentalize the operation with each staff member having a responsibility in one or several areas, with the overall administration and responsibility of the operation belonging to the executive director, Mr. Byers.

Working on the administration staff and carrying out some of these responsibilities is Warren Brown, an assistant executive director, whose responsibility is in the area of enforcement and interpretation. Working with him are Ralph McFillen, who spends the major part of his time as a field investigator; a new man to be hired to assist in this work, and Miss Fannie Vaughan, who administers the 1.600 legislation.

With the departure of Charles Neinas, who was with us approximately ten years, it became necessary to do some reorganization within the staff, and as a result of his departure Gene Duffy has been made an assistant executive director, and his prime responsibility is directing all the championship events of the Association. Working with Duffy in his area are two young men, Grayle Howlett, who is promotion director, and Tom Combs, a new man on our staff who is helping out in the events area. Duffy's responsibility also includes the College Division affairs.

Another assistant executive director is Tom Hansen, who took over some of Neinas' duties in general administration. Mr. Hansen also serves as the assistant director for the football TV program. Working in his area is Jerry Miles, who came to us last September as editor of the NCAA NEWS and has now been named director of public relations. A new NEWS editor will be hired in the immediate future.

A new man was hired recently, who is to report February 14. Ted Tow will take over as director of publications and eventually take over the operation of the College Athletics Publishing Service, which is now located in Phoenix, Arizona. With the completion of the new building, the operation will be moved into the new structure.

As President Ramer pointed out, I am the controller of the organization, and working in this area is Marjorie Fieber, who probably is the best known of anybody on the staff and has been with the Association for many years. Also in this area is James H. Wilkinson, who has been director of the Summer Sports Program for a little over two years.

Another member of the staff is Lou Spry, who is now serving as assistant to the executive director, having served as publications editor for several years.

Briefly, that is the organization of the Association, with each person responsible in his own area, and all of us of course responsible to the Executive Director.

As far as the financial affairs of the Association are concerned, I am happy to report that they are in good shape. Our budget now approximates one million dollars per year. The sources of income for the Association are membership dues, meets and tournaments, income from investments and several miscellaneous sources.

Until the present time the University Division Basketball Tournament has generated approximately 65 per cent of the Association's income and has carried more than its share of the load. For the first time in the history of the Association, we will now begin to take income from the television programs for general operating purposes. Until this time there has been a 2½ per cent assessment against the television program, and that money has been used to promote football directly and indirectly by the NCSS in New York and for the underwriting of postgraduate scholarships. There has been no money from the television program used for the general operating expenses of the Association.

Now, for the first time, under the new plan there is an additional 1½ per cent, making a total assessment of 6 per cent, and that 1½ per cent will be diverted to the general operating budget of the Association. It is primarily earmarked to assist in the construction of the new building.

You may be interested to know something about the new building, for which we are in the final stages of approving plans and specifications. We hope by January 10 to place the matter before the contractors for bidding, which will take approximately three weeks or one month, and then there will be a cooling-off period to review the plans and make whatever modifications are necessary. The building is scheduled to begin somewhere between the first and the tenth of March.

President Ramer: An important part of this Association's program resides in the enforcement activities. These efforts involve our attempt to keep institutional members in proper alignment with the Association's principles and policies. Warren Brown is charged with this responsibility, as a portion of our total staff effort. I would like to ask Warren to talk with you about the Association's enforcement program.

Warren Brown (NCAA Staff): I might briefly dwell on the philosophy of the enforcement program. I would like to concentrate my remarks on the procedures which are followed in the process of infraction cases.

The authority to discipline members may be found on page 17 of the NCAA Manual, Constitution 4-6-(c), which in effect gives the Council the authority to impose penalties upon the membership. The Council has the authority to appoint a Committee on Infractions. This Committee, of which George Young of the University of Wisconsin is chairman, is a fact-finding arm of the NCAA Council.

Any time the executive director or the Committee on Infractions receives information of an alleged violation of the NCAA rules or regulations, the Committee on Infractions is charged with the responsibility of making inquiry or investigating this information. In so doing, it has the field investigator or investigating staff contact all the principals involved in the case to attempt to develop the facts and additional information which may assist the Committee on Infractions in arriving at a determination of whether there is any substance in the reported allegations.

When the Committee on Infractions believes the information is of some substance, it then notifies the member institution involved that its programs and policies are subject to investigation. This is called a notice of preliminary inquiry; a written notice filed with the director of athletics of the institution involved, in effect setting forth certain pertinent provisions of the NCAA enforcement procedure and notifying the institution that there will be somebody out in the field collecting information concerning different allegations which have been made.

We have now one full-time investigator, and the Executive Committee has authorized the employment of an additional man within the very near future. In addition, I sometimes am out in the field investigating, and we have two people on our permanent staff in the Kansas City office who also go out. When we feel the situation calls for it, we hire professional investigators to obtain information for us.

The information is collected by the field investigators, and if the Committee on Infractions feels this information has developed to the point where there is a possibility of a violation and the information is substantiated, it then files with the institution an official inquiry. This inquiry contains a statement of the allegation and asks

the chief executive officer of the institution to provide certain information related to these allegations. The institution in turn does respond to the official inquiry and this response is directed to the Committee on Infractions.

Once a written response is submitted to the Committee on Infractions, the institution has the opportunity to appear before the Committee on Infractions to discuss the information requested in the official inquiry, as well as any other information which they feel is related to the statement of allegation. This appearance before the Committee on Infractions by the institution is a fact-finding type of meeting. When you appear before the Committee on Infractions in response to an inquiry, there has been no finding of fact. It is only an attempt by the Committee on Infractions to develop all information and provide for the institution an opportunity to present its side of the case.

After the appearance the Committee on Infractions has the responsibility of determining whether there is a violation involved, and if it does, then it reports to the NCAA Council its findings of violation as well as any other information related to the case and the determination of the final conclusion of the case. At the time that report is filed, the chief executive of the institution receives a copy of the report, as well as the director of athletics and the faculty representative.

This report, which is called a confidential report, sets forth the Committee's findings, the statement of violation, and also indicates those people who have been interviewed, or at least those sources who wish to be identified. It states how the case originated, and it provides related information which is pertinent to the judgment of the case. When the confidential report has been forwarded to the Council and the member institution, the member institution has the right to appear before the Council to provide any other information which it feels is pertinent. The institution appears before the Council, at which time the confidential report is reviewed by all parties present, and the Council makes its findings of violation and imposes a penalty which it believes is appropriate for the violation.

So, briefly, the institution involved does have the opportunity to present its side of the case on two occasions, and hopefully by the time the Council makes its finding on the violation the facts have been fully developed and the issues are clear.

The penalty structure of the Association is also outlined in the enforcement procedures and may be found in the Manual. As a general principle, the penalties are broad where the violations are broad. If the violations are limited, the penalty is limited. That is the general principle followed by the Council in imposing penalties.

An institution found to be in violation, after a penalty has been imposed, may not appeal the penalty unless it can show newly discovered evidence related to the findings of the Council and not available to them at the time they arrived at their conclusions. Or the institution can show there was a prejudicial error in the case itself by the Committee on Infractions or the Council. Those are the only two bases on which an appeal for reconsideration may be made.

I would also like to explain to you the method or procedure by which interpretations to the NCAA Constitution and Bylaws are in-

stituted, apart from the enforcement program.

The procedure for interpretation of the Constitution and Bylaws is set forth in the NCAA Constitution, Article 6, Section 2, and in effect it provides that the NCAA Council, between Conventions, and in the interim between Council meetings, the Interpretation Committee, which is the president, the secretary-treasurer and the executive director, may issue interpretations to the Constitution and Bylaws. The interpretations issued by either party become binding upon the membership when circulated in the NCAA News, and therefore it becomes very important that the membership pay attention to the interpretations section of the News. Upon circulation those interpretations are binding, and any violation results in implementation of enforcement procedures. The News is issued approximately twice a month, and it is a good idea to clip the interpretation section and put it in your Manual.

Any member institution has the right to ask the Convention for a review of any interpretation issued by the NCAA Council, and the procedure followed is to notify the executive director, who in turn places it in the Convention program and it is brought before the Convention for review. Any interpretation made by the Interpretation Committee must be approved in turn at the next Council meeting, so in effect the Council approved all the interpretations in the Constitution and Bylaws at one point or another.

In actual practice, the member institution or its representative contacts the executive office, and if it is not a unique question or if it has been answered before, the answer is simply given to the person inquiring at this time. But if it is a unique question where the application of the rule involved may not be clear, then of course it is always placed before the Interpretation Committee and then before the Council for decision.

As a closing note, I want to encourage all of you to contact our office in Kansas City any time you have any questions concerning interpretations of rules and regulations, and we will be glad to provide you with any assistance in that regard.

President Ramer: I would like to emphasize one aspect, the institution's own obligation for self-study and self-disclosure. I think no gesture of acceptance of this obligation of educational soundness to which I referred could be used in better fashion than the disposition of the personnel of a given institution to keep its own program fully and clearly consistent with those of the appropriate conference and the NCAA.

In the cleanup position today is Walter Byers, our executive director, and we have asked Walter if he might comment on public relations. We seem to have the faculty of getting in the news on many fronts at times. We have asked Walter to comment on some of our public relations and in addition to consider what has been said by his colleagues in the proceedings and see whether there may be additional comments he may want to make about the program of our Association. I invite Walter Byers, our executive director, to the lectern.

Walter Byers (Executive Director, NCAA): Mr. President and gentlemen, the NCAA is more or less a two-way organization. On the one hand we attempt to provide rather diligently quality services, pleas-

antly and promptly, where they have to do with the official playing rules and the guidance of the Association in the conduct of the various national collegiate and college institutional championships for which we are responsible, and in many other areas of service—your post-graduate scholarship program and devices we use in electronic media. Whatever it may be, it is our philosophy to try to perform with some distinction and do it with some efficiency.

On the other hand, we are a regulatory and disciplinary body. By letter and by telephone, constantly we are saying "no" to member institutions who want to do something they feel they are compelled to do or they would like to do for the advancement of their own interests and their own program.

For example, in a single day Warren Brown answered 36 telephone requests for interpretations. I didn't ask him how many times he said "yes," but I suspect he said "no" 36 times.

That constant regulatory function of our staff does put a strain on our relations with the membership from time to time, even though we are merely carrying out the decisions reached by this instrument of enforcement, the Association Council.

From our own family experience, I am sure we are often aware of the strain placed on our family relations and the members of the families. It doesn't take much imagination to project that situation to the broader aspect of the NCAA regulatory function, which is carried out in public relations when the penalty and treatment is published in the town newspaper. That is the way it has to be done.

The NCAA has performed these dual functions for many years, and we suggest no change in the pattern. But we must try to have a better understanding of those functions.

As far as the administrative philosophy is concerned, our staff is totally conscious of its responsiveness. The membership's decision is reached in annual Convention, and those decisions are implemented and interpreted by the NCAA Executive Committee and our staff in Kansas City. The principle we try to instill in our office is one of impartiality and fairness. If there is anything I have attempted to stand for in the several years I have been in this position, it is that we will treat each institution, black or white, rich or poor, the same way. Whether we are talking of regulation or discipline, whether it is a small institution or a major university, they will get the same answer to the same question, and there will be no partiality or favoritism. I hope we have carried that philosophy to the point where, even though you may disagree with the answer you get to a question, or there may be some irritation in the disciplinary and enforcement area, the philosophy of fairness has earned for our staff the reputation of impartiality.

President Ramer: May I emphasize one thing that Walter mentioned, namely the fundamental responsibility of the Council and the Executive Committee for the development of policy and executive regulations and interpretations, carrying those into effect. It is easy to criticize the men who must carry out fundamental policies and put them into effect, but I want to share with you gentlemen the feeling of the Executive Committee and the Council of your Association that Walter and his colleagues in the national office carry out these policies faithfully without partiality and without favoritism, and I must say

with a degree of stringency and expertness which you and I should respect. When you or I come to the point of criticism or condemnation of actions of this Association, blame it on the Council, blame the Executive Committee, but be careful about attaching that blame or that criticism to Warren or Art or Walter or any other member of our career staff in Kansas City. They are merely carrying the policies of the Association into effect as developed by the Council and interpreted by the Executive Committee.

We have presented to you this morning items we thought might be of interest to you. It is your time to talk. We have members of the Council and the Executive Committee present, and we urge you at this time to raise questions or issues that you feel ought to be discussed in our organization. The floor is open now for discussion.

W. E. Leckie (Colorado School of Mines): We have written and never received an answer, about the 1.600 particularly. It must be of importance, for at least half of the issues in the journal deal with that point. I have never seen an issue that didn't have it somewhere. Why don't we get this thing clearly stated that it is not under Extra Events. The 1.600 shows up under Extra Events.

President Ramer: You have an excellent point. We do have a lot of misunderstanding on that interpretation of 1.600. Bill has asked about the Extra Events association. We require full compliance of these institutions, in accordance with the 1.600 provision, so that in effect our compliance has broader implication than merely for service and anticipated service in the Extra Events of the Association.

Now, in regard to the specific interpretations, I am concerned by our apparent failure to respond to specific questions, if I understood you correctly.

Mr. Leckie: I will take that back—not a specific question but a suggestion.

President Ramer: We again have an amendment concerned with the 1.600 coming before you Saturday. You will have an opportunity to vote against the whole 1.600 program. There is an amendment. I must confess there are some who feel it is so complex and so difficult to administer that it is questionable. Personally, I do not have that feeling. I have avoided that from the very beginning. I think it is an insurance, however difficult its administration may be, in which you and I as faculty representatives have come to realize at least some academic floor for participation in intercollegiate athletics. I think it is a gesture of this organization that has been respected by our academic colleagues throughout the nation.

Mr. Leckie: I want to say I fully support the 1.600. I just think it is in the wrong place in our book.

Mr. Byers: I think Bill's question was as to the original policy on this point. As I interpret his inquiry, he wants to know why this rule is in Article 4 of the Bylaws and not in Article 4 of the Constitution; why it wasn't placed in the part of the rules which cover member institutions of all types, because the effect of it is if you are eligible for NCAA events you have to apply the 1.600 regulation throughout the season.

I don't think there is a good philosophical answer to your question. Those who developed the legislation and planned its application offered the amendment to the Bylaws for a majority vote and it was

carried by the majority vote. I think a substantial proportion of the membership supported it at the time. Whether it was a two-thirds vote, I don't know—with a two-thirds vote it could be in the Constitution now.

I understand your criticism. It is a fair criticism. It was a criticism made by several Eastern institutions who are opposed to the legislation. I do not quarrel with your contention. It would be a better piece of legislation if it were put some place where all the members had to abide by it as a part of the Constitution, and it would control them. I might say the question arose in the NCAA Council meeting with the Financial Aid Committee, as to the number of awards or candidates. The policy question was raised that it should go into Article 4. It could possibly be offered as an amendment to the Constitution first, and then if adopted there it would go into the Bylaws and be applicable to member institutions at all times.

President Ramer: This difficulty is not centered exclusively in one point of this 1,600 legislation. We are speaking about the difficulty involved between the establishment of eligibility for NCAA events and for regular in-season eligibility. Several members of the Council question frankly the need for the distinction in eligibility we have been making through the years. Some of the members of the Council have been putting this question: Why do we continue that distinction between in-season eligibility and eligibility for NCAA events. We have a committee working on that particular question right now. I am hoping it may come up with some kind of solution.

Wilfred Crowley (West Coast Athletic Conference): I think one of the problems here would be this matter of dual membership. There are some who hold membership in other organizations, and consequently they feel they must abide by the second floor of the NCAA rules because of this dual membership. Wouldn't that problem have to be resolved before you settle the other problem?

President Ramer: I think you are right. There may indeed be other reasons why this section needs to continue. But we are working on that.

Warren S. Brown: I might try to clarify the point that Father Crowley raised. I am not sure placing rules for championship events into a part of the Constitution and Bylaws would make it mandatory to all competition. I am not sure that would affect dual membership. In fact I don't believe it would. Obviously, if you are a member of both organizations, you would have to abide by the more stringent rule if each had a rule on a similar subject. If you are a member of the NCAA, you have to abide by the rules of the organization. If they are more stringent than those of some other organization you belong to, you still have to abide by the rules of the NCAA.

President Ramer: Let me thank you for your presence here. We have wound up with at least 150 in attendance. We are grateful to you for coming.

[The session adjourned at 9:40 a.m.]

OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

Thursday, January 6, 1972

The opening business session of the Sixty-Sixth Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened in the Convention Hall of the Diplomat Hotel, Hollywood, Florida, at 10:10 a.m., Earl M. Ramer, NCAA President and professor of education at the University of Tennessee, presiding.

1. OPENING REMARKS

[President Ramer introduced the members of the NCAA Council, Executive Committee and administrative staff of the Kansas City office, as listed on pages 5-7.]

President Ramer: We have the pleasure and good fortune of having with us today two colleagues from Canada who are representatives of an agency that is the NCAA counterpart in Canada, the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union. I would like to introduce Mr. Carl Totzke, president of the CIAU, and Bob Pugh, executive director of the CIAU. We are delighted to have both of you gentlemen with us. We want you to stay freely in the meetings and this Convention. We are grateful for your attendance.

You have in your hands the program for the Sixty-Sixth Annual Convention, and as we consider the agenda today let me suggest that you use this book rather than the preliminary Official Notice you received some weeks ago. An important reason for the continuing use of the large red book is the fact that the numbering system for the amendments has been slightly changed since the issuance of the Official Notice. All our references to agenda items will be references to the program of our red book.

The yellow pages contain the proposed amendments before our Association. The green pages include the proposals from our Financial Aid Committee to be considered in discussions at the round table program this afternoon. The pink pages include the full publication of the 1971-72 Manual.

Let me emphasize the importance of the round table discussion scheduled for this afternoon, concentrating your attention on proposed legislation to curtail the rising cost of intercollegiate athletics. Let me remind you that the report of the Financial Aid Committee was sent to each member institution several weeks ago. Most of our member institutions studied that report, reviewed the report and sent recommendations for its modification back to our central office. The suggestions have been used in the modification of that report, and I am sure that all of us will find this further study of that excellent report to our mutual interest and use this afternoon.

Remember that these proposals will not be voted upon during this Convention. Later you will hear of a proposed special convention during which time those proposals will be considered.

On page 17, Amendment No. 1, let me suggest that you remove the University of Tennessee and District of Columbia Teachers College as sources of the recommendation and replace those sources with the

NCAA Council, which is endorsing this amendment. The Council is also joining the Atlantic Coast Conference in endorsing the second proposed amendment, the one concerning Financial Aid.

On page 18, Item 3 will be amended. I will not undertake at this point to describe the nature of the contemplated change, nor will I in any of the other proposed changes. I merely at this point will alert you to the impending change which will be given to you in written form at our business session Saturday morning.

On page 22, Item 14, the sixth line, you will see the word "individual" having been preceded by the word "such," "such individual." Please mark out the word "individual" and replace that marginally with the word "representative." You will note earlier in the paragraph that the term "representative" is the antecedent to that reference.

Please note Item 19 on pages 24 and 25. The Council is joining MacMurray College in the endorsement of that particular item.

Item No. 20 you will note has reference to the Bylaws, Article 3, Section 1(b), page 65. Please strike out "page 65" and replace that with "page 38." This will be important in the event some of you want to refer to that current provision in the pink pages.

Item 25 on page 27 should read this way: To permit junior college transfers who are predictors on the national table to be immediately eligible, and so on. Then at the end of that segment, after the terminal words, "transferable degree credit" place a comma rather than a period and add: "without any qualitative attainment."

On page 33 and page 35, proposals 37 and 42, identified in the boxes. The Council failed to get these two items into the agenda on time, and we will have to ask your unanimous consent for attention given to these on Saturday.

On page 37, Item 45, please remove University of Tennessee and District of Columbia Teachers College as sponsoring agents for that and substitute Council sponsorship.

On page 38, please note Council endorsement of Item No. 51, and on page 39, Council endorsement of Item No. 54; also on page 40, the addition of Council endorsement of Item No. 58, joining Kent State University in the sponsorship of this amendment.

On page 41 there were errors involved in No. 60, and the Council will ask consent Saturday to withdraw this completely.

On page 43, Item 67 will be replaced by two Official Interpretations, and these will be distributed to you.

On pages 44 and 45 you will note Item No. 68 through Item No. 71 are executive regulations and not in the form of proposed amendments. These are regulations adopted previously by our Executive Committee and currently in effect. They are not up for vote. Nevertheless, you may raise questions, point out issues or indeed challenge their continuing existence as executive regulations. It is possible for these regulations to be overturned on the convention floor. No. 68 and No. 70 will be amended, and you will have these amendments in writing.

On pages 45, Item No. 73 will be amended, and we will present to you in revised wording at that time three resolutions, including the present wording as one of those three.

On page 46 please note Council endorsement of Item No. 74.

You have on the reverse side of your identification badge brief explanations of our voting procedure. I am going to ask our former President and present parliamentarian for this session, Harry Cross, professor of law, University of Washington, to review our voting procedure. I am suggesting that he make reference not only to distinctions that occur in our voting procedures between Bylaw revisions and Constitution revisions and our use of ballots, but also our procedure for amending the amendments.

2. EXPLANATION OF VOTING PROCEDURES

Harry Cross (University of Washington): As a matter of efficiency, it is probably better, with the large number of items to come before the convention, to have the voting done by either voice vote or by a show of hands in all situations where it can be done.

The requirement of the Constitution is that amendments to it be carried by two-thirds majority of those present and voting. The ruling has been in the past that interpretations of the Constitution are subject to the same two-thirds voting requirement, whereas the Bylaws and interpretations of the Bylaws call for merely a majority vote. Voting may be by voice, by a show of hands, by rising, by ballot or even by roll call. If a ballot is called for, it will be done by the presentation to the tellers of the Voting Committee of the appropriate part of the numbered ballots, each of which has two parts in different colors, and the number of the ballot which will be used will be identified at the time a ballot vote is called for. The authorized voting delegate will present the proper part of the card to the teller. If there is a standing vote, the person who is authorized to vote is the one to stand. If he is not available, his substitute may vote for him, as may be done also in the ballot vote. In the other votes, it would be only the authorized delegate who would do the voting.

It is permissible in parliamentary procedure for a two-thirds vote to be done by voice, and I think the President will try to have all the votes by voice as an initial proposition, with perhaps in some situations a show of hands rather than the longer procedure of a standing vote.

The room has been divided into eight sections, which are not designed to locate you by your district but to simplify counting if there is a standing vote, by the tellers.

If on the two-thirds vote the Chair is in doubt as to whether or not it is carried by the necessary majority, there will have to be a vote in an additional manner.

The matters with reference to amendments are covered by our provisions in the Constitution and Bylaws. The item is Article 7 on page 22 of the pink pages, being the Constitutional provision.

We start with the proposition that the proposals in the yellow pages are essentially before this convention, and if there is not someone to move the adoption of the particular proposal, the Chair will ask the consent of the convention that it be withdrawn.

If there is a desire to propose a modification of the printed items in the yellow pages, it may be done, if that proposal is presented in writing to the Secretary. A convenient place would be the office where there will be someone to receive it. It must be presented before 1:00 p.m. tomorrow, and it is an acceptable item for considera-

tion if the proposal to amend the amendment does not increase the modification of the provision of the Constitution or Bylaw which is proposed. Obviously, for those members who do not have delegates at the convention, a proposal to make the change more extensive than that of which they have been notified would be unfair to them. A less extensive change is permissible.

The problem has arisen from time to time as to whether a particular matter before the convention is of primary concern only to some of the member institutions, and if it might be desirable that those be the ones to make the decision. Under the provisions of the Constitution, each member institution has the right to vote, and our pattern which has been followed in the past does not in any sense deny that right. It merely recognizes the complication I have identified when we are a single assembly. The procedure that has been followed in the past is this: That in those situations the Council, having rather generously discussed these particular proposals, thought it might be appropriate to suggest to the members that they should ask themselves, in their own conscience, whether this is an appropriate place to vote, and if they conclude it is an appropriate place to vote of course to do so. If they conclude it is not, then in their conscience I suggest, in fairness to others, they decide not to vote. That suggestion is made at the direction of the Council, after the Council has discussed the problem, whether or not this is one of the situations where this procedure might lead to a conclusion more satisfactory to the membership at large.

3. FURTHER EXPLANATIONS BY THE PRESIDENT

President Ramer: Tomorrow morning there is a division in the round tables for the University Division and the College Division. This matter of legislative reorganization will be treated in both of those meetings. This so-called conscience procedure to which Harry referred is really our informal response to a need in this organization for clean and clear recognition of varied interests and problems, depending upon the size of the institution. Our Committee on Legislative Reorganization, under the chairmanship of Dave Swank, has been giving attention to this problem and will have some tentative proposals to present to you. Both of these round tables will hope to receive some feedback from you at that time and thus be influenced in the development of the final report, which may be given attention in a special convention of this Association.

Given attention also in both of these round tables will be the matter of intercollegiate athletic competition for women. If we contend, as a matter of principle, that intercollegiate athletics is a sound educational experience for all, on what basis then do we restrict that educational experience to men athletes? That question is being put all over this nation, as you know, and we are facing a number of points in the courts of the nation. The whole question is the eligibility in this organization for female competition in men's events.

Let me emphasize also the Honors Luncheon Friday noon. At this time we give recognition to student-athletes who have received post-graduate scholarships. During each of these Honor sessions, we have also honored participants in some important aspect of American life who had meaningful participation in intercollegiate athletics as young

men. We are concentrating on the national news media for this particular Honors Luncheon. We are also honoring a gentleman, a former member of this Council, President of Hampton Institute, an active worker in the NCAA, the Honorable Jerome Holland, currently our American Ambassador to Sweden. He is receiving the sixth Theodore Roosevelt Award of our Association, the highest award our Association can bestow.

I would like to emphasize also the district meetings Friday afternoon. You will be able there to consider the proposed amendments from the standpoint of the interest of those institutions in your particular area.

Let me call your attention in the Official Program to the reports of Rules and Meet Tournament Committees on the agenda for the morning. These appear in the copy of the 1970-71 Annual Reports, which you have received. They contain our various financial reports and the summary of statistical information. I would entertain a motion to accept these reports at this time.

[Motion was regularly made, seconded and carried, that the reports referred to be accepted.]

4. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER:

Samuel E. Barnes (District of Columbia Teachers College): Mr. President and Gentlemen: The Constitution of the Association provides that the Secretary-Treasurer shall submit to this annual convention a report of all receipts and disbursements during the preceding fiscal year which ended August 31. In addition to this financial report, I shall provide information related to the status of the NCAA's membership.

Francis A. Wright and Company, Kansas City, Missouri, a firm of certified public accountants, has completed an audit of the Association's financial status for the period beginning September 1, 1970, and terminating August 31, 1971. This report can be found on pages 120-128 of the 1970-71 Annual Reports, a copy of which is available at the registration desk to each delegate attending this convention. The financial examination of the NCAA was supplemented by audit reports furnished by certified public accountants in New York and Phoenix, these organizations reviewing the financial operations of the National Collegiate Sports Services and the Collegiate Athletics Publishing Service, respectively.

For the 1970-71 fiscal year, the NCAA's total assets amounted to \$1,692,483.24 as compared to \$1,397,618.57 for 1969-70, an increase of \$294,864.67. The increase in assets can be attributed to an increase in the cash on hand and an increase in the investment in the National Collegiate Realty Corporation. You may recall that during the 1969-70 fiscal year the cash on hand was decreased to a great extent as a result of the purchase of land for the new building.

The general income for 1970-71 was \$1,111,006.72 as against \$695,080.58 in 1969-70, an increase of \$415,926.14. General operating expenses amounted to \$799,700.04 as against \$611,191.92 in 1969-70. The increase in income can be attributed to record revenues from meets and tournaments and a fine improvement in income from investments. The increase in expenses can be charged to general inflationary pressures, additional meetings and an increase in the executive staff. It

is interesting to note that the general cash flow handled by the executive office during 1970-71 amounted to approximately \$6,500,000, including the NCAA operation and the National Summer Youth Sports Program.

During the 1970-71 fiscal year, the assets of the National Collegiate Realty Corporation increased to \$355,534.70. The 3.4 acres which the Corporation owns for purposes of constructing a new office building is in a highly desirable location, and based upon present and projected land values in the immediate area, the land and planned building should appreciate in value and represent a beneficial investment.

I am pleased to report that the Association's membership continues to grow and now totals 757 members. Included in the 757 total are 657 active members, 43 allied members, 32 associate members and 25 affiliated members.

New members which joined the Association within the past year are as follows:

ACTIVE

District 1

Framingham State College
University of Maine, Presque Isle

District 2

St. John Fisher College

District 3

Armstrong State College
Baptist College, Charleston
Bowie State College
Delta State College
District of Columbia Teachers College
Florence State University
Jacksonville State University
Livingston University
Samford University
University of Tampa
Troy State University
Virginia Commonwealth University

District 4

Indiana Central College
University of Minnesota, Morris
Ohio Northern University

District 5

Drury College
Oral Roberts University

District 8

Pacific College of Fresno

ASSOCIATE

Eisenhower College
Indiana State University, Evansville
Lambuth College
Meramec Community College
Northern Kentucky State College
Wiley College

ALLIED

Gulf South Conference
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference.

Mr. President, this concludes the report of the Secretary-Treasurer, including the printed audit, and I move that it be received.

[The motion was seconded, put to vote and carried.]

5. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Polk F. Robison (Texas Tech University): Mr. President and Members of the Association: The Executive Committee, elected annually by the Association's Council, consists of seven members plus the NCAA President, the Secretary-Treasurer and Vice-President-At-Large. The Committee meets three times each year—January, April and August—to administer the Association's business and financial affairs, including the conduct of the National Collegiate and National College Division Championship Events.

The activities and functions of the Association continue to increase and your Executive Committee urges the membership to look to the NCAA News for general information and official actions, including interpretations of rules. With the stepped-up publication of the News, the Committee feels that timely and up-to-date information is now readily available to member institutions.

Your attention is directed to pages 9 through 13 of the Annual Reports, which contain a statistical review of the 1970-71 academic year. This report contains information on membership growth, sports sponsorship and participation in championship events.

During the course of the year, the Committee accepted the resignations of two members of the administrative staff, Bruce Skinner as editor of the News, and Charles M. Neinas, a ten-year veteran of the staff, who left the NCAA to become commissioner of the Big Eight Conference. During his NCAA tenure, Neinas made many valuable contributions to the affairs of the Association and his efforts are sincerely appreciated. The Committee wishes him well in his new endeavor. As a result of Neinas' departure, a reorganization in the executive office was effected with Eugene Duffy being named assistant executive director; Louis J. Spry as assistant to the executive director; Jerry Miles, who replaced Skinner as News editor, was named public relations director; Grayle Howlett as director of promotion; Thomas Combs, a new member of the staff as of September 1, as events manager, and Shirley Whitacre has been named administrative assistant. In the immediate future, a new man will be employed to serve as News editor, and on February 14 of this year, Ted C. Tow, a former college sports information director and currently a professional public relations consultant, will join the NCAA as publications editor and will succeed Homer F. Cooke as director of the College Athletics Publishing Service when the latter retires on or about January 1, 1973. In addition, the Executive Committee has approved the employment of an additional man to assist in the area of investigations, and he will be hired immediately.

It is gratifying to report that the 1971 National Summer Youth Sports Program enjoyed a most successful operation. Participating in 1971 were 111 institutions in 66 cities (34 states and the District of Columbia) with more than 40,000 young people participating. As re-

ported previously, the program is a joint undertaking on the part of the United States Government, the participating institutions and the NCAA. In 1971 the total cost of the program was \$5,511,963, with the Federal Government contributing \$2,916,119, the participating institutions \$2,429,119, industry and state and local governments \$116,725 and the NCAA in excess of \$50,000. At the present time there are no funds for a 1972 National Summer Youth Sports Program because legislation that previously provided for this program was recently vetoed by President Nixon. However, it is hoped that the program will not only be continued in 1972 but that it can be expanded on a year-round basis and placed on a continuous-funding basis through improved Congressional legislation.

During 1971 the Association's Television Committee developed a plan for the continuation of controlled football television. This plan was overwhelmingly approved by the membership and will be placed into effect in the fall of 1972. It will mark the first time a percentage of television receipts is to be channeled into the NCAA's general budget. In supporting this move on the part of the Television Committee, the Executive Committee held it appropriate that football should begin to bear some share of the Association's general operating costs. Throughout the years, approximately 63 per cent of NCAA income has been produced from basketball revenues, and any great increase from that source cannot be expected. Because of an enlarged executive staff and increased services to the membership, there is need for more revenue. Accordingly, the Executive Committee looked to the football television program for this additional income.

During its April and August meetings, the Executive Committee considered reports and recommendations from the Investment-Building Committee concerning the condition of the Association's investment account and plans for the new building. It is the feeling of the Executive Committee that much of the deadwood has been eliminated from the investment account, that the account is being effectively administered and that revenues from it are increasing. The Committee approved the recommendation that \$100,000 of the Association's securities be made available for underwriting a part of the building costs. Also, the Committee gave support to the recommended building plans, and as of this date plans and specifications are in final stages subject to final approval. It is contemplated that construction will begin in March 1972.

As reported during the 1971 Convention, the International Gymnastics Federation recognized the United States Gymnastics Federation as its United States member. The USGF assumed those duties and responsibilities with vigor and is making excellent progress to strengthen its position in world gymnastics affairs. The United States Wrestling Federation, acting on the recommendation of the International Wrestling Federation, has formed a commission to serve as this country's international representative and is making fine progress on both domestic and international levels. Recently, the Wrestling Federation assumed responsibility to organize and finance teams to participate in junior and senior world championships, the junior event being held in Japan and the senior in the Balkans. The Basketball, Baseball and Track and Field Federations continue to make steady progress, and the future of all the federations appears bright. In May

1971, President Ramer, Charles Neinas and G. R. Woodruff represented the NCAA in a meeting with John B. Kelly Jr., Ollan Cassell and Richard Harkins of the AAU. Although the session progressed on a cordial note, nothing of significance developed.

Turning to matters related to the conduct of NCAA championship events, the Committee approved the establishment of a National College Division Soccer Championship to be inaugurated in 1972, the format of the event being similar to that now in effect in the National Collegiate Soccer Championship. In order to accommodate the majority of academic schedules now in effect among the membership, the Committee approved the first Thursday in June as the opening date for the National Collegiate Track and Field Championships.

After a lapse of one year, the Association's Media Seminar will be renewed in 1972 with the meeting being scheduled February 14-16 at Louisiana State University.

During the past 1½ years, the NCAA has developed a fine relationship with the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union, its counterpart in Canada. The Executive Committee is pleased to report that the organizations will initiate an exchange of athletic competition in 1973 when the championship ice hockey teams of the CIAU and the NCAA will meet in a home-and-home series. This event promises to be a most interesting venture and can be the beginning of international competition in other sports.

Mr. President, this concludes the report of the Executive Committee, and I move its acceptance and approval, including the detailed accounting of our activities as recorded in the 1970-71 Annual Reports. This does not include revised executive regulations numbered 68 through 71, pages 44-45 of the Convention Program yellow pages. These automatically will continue in effect unless the Convention disapproves or revises them Saturday.

[The motion was seconded, put to vote and carried.]

6. REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

H. Boyd McWhorter (University of Georgia): Mr. President and Delegates to the Sixty-Sixth Annual Convention: It is my privilege and pleasure to present to you this morning the report of the NCAA Council. As most of you know, the Council is responsible for "the establishment and direction of the general policy of the Association in the interim between annual Conventions." Each of its 18 members has been elected by an annual Convention, and each is responsible and responsive to the NCAA membership.

The abridged minutes of the Council are printed on pages 52 through 96 in the 1970-71 Annual Reports, copies of which are available at the registration desk. After perusal of these minutes, I am sure you will agree that 1971 has been a busy year for your Council.

Special attention has been given during the past year to four important administrative areas: Reorganization of the enforcement procedure, financial aid, recruiting and legislative reorganization of the Association itself. Each of these critical subjects has been studied at length by special committees appointed by the Council.

The Council conducted a special meeting in early October to consider the final report of the Special Committee on Financial Aid. Legislation advancing all but one of the Committee's recommenda-

tions was drafted at a second October meeting and distributed to the membership for discussion purposes on December 15. This same material is included in the green section of your Convention Program. This afternoon's round table will be devoted to these proposals which are being offered for discussion only.

Saturday's business session will consider Council-sponsored resolutions calling for a special convention to act upon the financial aid legislation and consider legislative reorganization of the Association. This precedent-setting meeting, which the Council believes is essential for the future improvement of college athletics and the NCAA itself, would take place before July 1, 1972.

The Association's enforcement program has undergone close scrutiny by the Council during the past year in the interests of improving its efficiency. As George H. Young, chairman of the Infractions Committee, has stated, "Justice delayed is too often justice denied." The Council is committed to a strong enforcement program, and an additional investigator will be employed to assist the Committee in bringing cases to a close more quickly. The Council believes the Committee on Infractions should be increased from three to five persons and its authority expanded. Details as to how these new enforcement procedures would operate are in draft form and will be submitted to the membership when perfected. In addition, the Council proposes the imposition of more severe penalties than in the past as an additional deterrent to possible violators.

Nine amendments or interpretations have been developed by the Special Committee on Recruiting and endorsed by the Council. If all are adopted, a prospective student-athlete would be limited to one expense-paid visit to not more than five colleges during his senior year in high school. After enrollment in a prep school or junior college, he may visit two institutions, once each. Any student-athlete who visits more than the permitted number of member colleges shall be ineligible for intercollegiate athletics. All institutions are required to keep a record of those who visit. A representative of athletic interests may not transport a prospect, his relatives or friends to visit the campus or elsewhere. An institutional employee or a representative of athletic interests may visit a prospect only twice before he signs a letter-of-intent, after which one additional visit may be made. Prospects may not be entertained anywhere except on the institution's campus.

Considerable reductions in costs are expected if these proposals are approved by the annual convention; however, it is clear the financial aid amendments under discussion still promise to result in the most dollar savings for member institutions.

Although much has been said in the news media during 1971 concerning a need to divide the NCAA for legislative purposes, this question has been discussed by the Council a number of times during the past three years. A Special Committee on Legislative Reorganization was formed with David Swank of the University of Oklahoma as chairman. Mr. Swank surveyed athletic directors and faculty representatives of member institutions, as well as executive officers of allied conferences, in order to determine the membership's feelings toward reorganization. A significant response of approximately 50 per cent resulted in an 80 per cent endorsement of the need to re-

organize the Association.

The Council recognizes that care must be exercised to assure that reorganization does not divide the Association—yet, it is clear that if done properly it will solve many important problems.

Although no final recommendation has been advanced by the Reorganization Committee, the subject will be discussed thoroughly at Friday morning's University and College Division Round Tables.

An important project undertaken in 1971 by the Council-appointed Drug Education Committee was printing a booklet aimed at educating coaches and administrators about drugs. Nearly 250,000 copies have been distributed to colleges, universities, junior colleges and high schools throughout the United States.

This concludes the report of the 1971 Council. Although the year was a difficult one, the Council feels it has faced even the most controversial issues squarely and that it has responded to the ever-changing needs of the membership. Mr. Chairman, I move acceptance and approval of the report of the Council for 1971, including the printed record to which I have referred.

[The motion was seconded, put to vote and carried.]

7. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

Rev. John J. Horgan (Seton Hall University): Mr. President and Gentlemen: At this time I wish to present to the delegation a list of those connected with athletics over the years who have passed away since our last meeting.

Following are the names submitted:

Joe Aillet, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute
Herc Alley, Vanderbilt University
Ernest E. Bearg, University of Nebraska
William J. Bingham, Harvard University
Wilbur S. Bohn, Washington State University
Robert E. Burns, University of the Pacific
Lyal W. Clark, Ohio State University
Frank Cramer, Cramer Chemical Company
Joseph Cutting, North Dakota State University
Richard Gordon, Hofstra University
Vernon L. Gregory, California State Polytechnic College, Pomona
Burwell Townes Harvey, Morehouse College
Oscar Hedlund, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Eugene L. Hill, Illinois State University
Gomer T. Jones, University of Oklahoma
J. Thomas Kibler, Washington College
Frank C. Kimbrough, West Texas State University
Albert D. Kirwan, University of Kentucky
Ben Light, Ithaca College
John I. Meinen, Bradley University
A. C. Moore, University of Tennessee, Chattanooga
Robert A. Morris Jr., Marshall University
Harold Musselman, California Institute of Technology
Herschel B. Northcutt, Southwestern at Memphis
Peter Felletta, University of San Francisco
William R. Reed, Big Ten Conference
Robert Sobolyk, Loyola University, New Orleans

John B. Stoeber, Thiel College
The Reverend Celestin J. Steiner, University of Detroit
Harry Strobel, Ohio State University
Earl J. Thomson, United States Naval Academy
Carroll Widdoes, Ohio University
E. E. Wieman, University of Denver
James Yeager, University of Colorado

Mr. President, I submit this report for approval and acceptance.
[The assembly rose and stood for one minute in silent tribute to their departed colleagues.]

8. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Marshall Turner (John Hopkins University): Mr. President, I believe some of us have noticed that one smiling Irish face you failed to mention in your introductions of the NCAA office. I move that we direct our secretary to send a telegram to Gene Duffy, to the effect that we miss him here, and send our best wishes and our sincere prayers for his speedy recovery and the success of the therapy he is now undergoing.

[The motion was seconded, put to vote and carried unanimously.]

George H. Hobson (Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that this convention send a letter to Dr. F. L. Forbes, former commissioner of the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, expressing our hope for his continued improvement in his illness.

[The motion was seconded, put to vote and carried unanimously.]

[The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.]

COMBINED FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES AND ATHLETIC DIRECTORS ROUND TABLE

Thursday Afternoon, January 6, 1972

The session convened in the Convention Hall at 2:05 p.m., Samuel E. Barnes, NCAA Secretary-Treasurer, District of Columbia Teachers College, presiding.

Chairman Barnes: The afternoon session is going to concern itself with what we think is a very, very important matter: Proposed Legislation to Curtail the Rising Costs of Intercollegiate Athletics.

Gentlemen, instead of intense concentration on campuses between beleaguered administrators and their shouting, signs-bearing, building-operating students, higher education's battleground is now moving into the executive suite and the board room.

The situation may be calmer, but its efforts seem to be much more serious. The controversy now is not so much over the war, student involvement, government research or minority admission, but whether the institution will be able to survive. The financial crux is most serious with the nation's private, secular and public institutions. A great number are operating under deficit budgets totalling millions of dollars. Many others are operating under binding budget restrictions.

The educated guess of the administrators is that the best they can hope to achieve in the 1972-73 fiscal year is a budget equal to their present one. With rising inflation, fewer industrial subsidies and diminishing alumni grants and higher negotiated salaries, it is obvious that some faculty members will be fired who normally might have been granted tenure.

The prevailing mood on campuses is a very grim one. Students have less time for protests and rallies. With the job market tightening up, they are becoming more seriously career-minded and are hitting the books much harder.

With the baby boom over, there will be a substantially smaller enrollment in elementary, secondary and higher education. This means fewer teaching and fewer administrative jobs for those majoring in education or enrolled for higher degrees.

Despite all the problems, the NCAA Council members believe that there are many positive aspects to the picture. However, the financial situation forces us to sit down and review the growth, the strengths and weaknesses, individually and on a cooperative basis, of athletics in schools of higher education. Gentlemen, we must hang together or we will hang separately.

Of what are we aware? That faculty staff, facilities, costs can be used more advantageously and more economically. However, the Council does not purport to magically solve the many complex problems. We only hope to reveal the levels of the problems which exist in fact. Talk is, of course, vital to the development of sound solutions to complex problems, but clever verbalization is a danger when it

hides plain truth and persuades hopeful listening to deception. Fascination with language seems at times to ring over recognition of reality. Things are given greater weight than action. Accomplishments are desperately needed. Honesty, character, sincerity, integrity will remain empty words until there is cessation of cheating, deceiving or making promises with no intent of fulfillment.

We can gain, if we will prevail—and if we recognize, like in traffic, the caution light that may very well save us the danger of coming up short on a red light.

What is one to believe? That institutions, administrators, coaches, athletic directors and faculties lament economy while spending lavishly, promise delusions while using duplicity, talk of equality while denying opportunity, espouse rules while taking unfair advantage, cry for more while giving less? To paraphrase John Donne, no man is an island unto himself; every man is a part of the main. Therefore, do not ask for whom the bell tolls. Gentlemen, it tolls for thee.

With this in mind, I will introduce the members of the panel, who will try to unconfuse you.

John Sawyer, professor of mathematics, Wake Forest University. Boyd McWhorter, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, University of Georgia.

William J. Flynn, director of athletics, Boston College.

Seaver Peters, director of athletics, Dartmouth College.

Harry Cross, professor of law, University of Washington.

Harry Cross will speak on the candidate acceptance form, William Flynn on financial aid limitation and John Sawyer on determination of financial need.

Harry M. Cross (University of Washington): I want to talk very briefly about some of the things in the structure here before I get to the candidate acceptance form.

You will notice in the program five constitutional provisions, the last two on one-year award and nonrenewal of aid. On the nonrenewal of aid, the Committee and the Council believe the one-year award is sound and should be the standard award, but there is also some need to protect the student-athlete who might in substance have been run off, but who might still be trying to do what he could. There ought to be some mechanics whereby he can have an opportunity to raise that kind of question.

This provision contemplates a committee which will have the opportunity to determine whether or not, despite his noncontinuance in the sport, his aid should be renewed.

The constitutional provisions are followed by the Bylaws provisions, essentially the substance of the proposal that will be discussed. This format is the consequence of the Council's deliberations and studying the Committee's report.

I might emphasize for you that this is no longer the Committee's baby. This was a specially appointed committee of the Council to report to the Council in the study on financial aid and possible changes that could be made on limitation of cost. The Council, after a substantial amount of discussion, voted by a very large majority to support the proposal in principle.

The next step was to take the various proposals and put them into a suggested legislative form. So these are the Council's proposals

now, in necessarily tentative form. The matter will be put in final form for consideration by the convention, by the membership, after all the advice, consultation and further studies that seem to be appropriate.

The principle involved in aid on the basis of need and limitations on the number of awards are matters of such significance to the membership that it ought to be adopted by means of a constitutional provision, and therefore these are stated in terms of authorization for the adoption or the delineation of the details of such a program. However, the idea of having it at the constitutional level or not is reserved. There has been some discussion as to whether or not it ought to all go in the Bylaws, and the Council, in its determination of fairness to the membership as a whole, took this course.

The candidate's acceptance form is to serve two principal purposes. The one which in many respects strikes me as the most important is to insulate the prospective student-athlete who, in fact, has determined where he wishes to go from constant harassment, importuning—more or less persuasive, more or less legitimate in their approaches—to get him to change his mind. With this device, it is the obligation of members of other institutions to not continue to recruit someone who has in a formal way identified what his choice is. This protects him from further bother, and obviously it is of great advantage to the youngster and his family to have this important decision made.

The second purpose is to help reduce the cost—and it does reduce the costs in the institutions that have followed it—involved in recruiting, not necessarily in first persuading the youngster but the cost of constantly keeping him persuaded. Having made his formal declaration, he is insulated from the constant pressure to change his mind, and you don't have to protect your position, at least at the same figure, as you do if everything is wide open.

There is a difference in this procedure from the interconference letter, with which many of you are familiar.

One of the points of criticism of the recruiters in athletic programs is the badgering, the persuading of the prospect; that you get him and tend to hold him by the lapel while he signs on the line in a physical or figurative sense. This declaration procedure calls for the tenure of the aid and the invitation for participation of sports in the institution by mail, and a so-called quiet period that extends from the day before the earliest time the mailing can be made (the earliest time is 12:00 to 1:00 a.m. Saturday morning) until noon of the following Friday. During that time it is improper under this procedure for any institutional representative to attempt to recruit the youngster.

The idea we found to be worthwhile in the Committee, and the Council apparently agrees, is that this makes it possible for the youngster and his family to arrive in a reasoned way at the determination of what institution to attend.

If the youngster under this procedure returns the candidate's acceptance form with the mailing date not later than 15 days after the initial offering date (or in later instances, 15 days after the mailing of the offer), the institution is committed to carry out its offer of financial aid, except of course in a situation where it is inadmissible or there is some misstatement in the details at that

point. As a practical matter, that is relatively unlikely, and the youngster has the assurance that if he returns the acceptance within the specified period of time, he will then have his arrangement certain and fixed.

There is a period in this return date provision during which it is possible for the recruiting process then to start; a quiet period ends about halfway through the return time.

The provisions of this plan and the possible language of the amendments of our rules include the admonition that an institution shall not send out at the initial mailing date more offerings or invitations than it is authorized to honor. In the event some of those who are invited to the institution in this program do not accept the invitation, then the offering institution obviously may send out additional tenders, and the same protection for the youngster is there—if he returns the invitation promptly, he will be assured of the aid, whereas if he returns it after that return period, the institution may determine whether or not to give the aid, with the obligation to make prompt notification to the youngster of that determination.

The mechanics of the operation beyond that are essentially that records have to be kept. We would anticipate that each conference would probably take care of its own institutions, and the NCAA would take care of the record keeping for other institutions.

In the event of signing with a particular institution and going some place else, there would be a loss of eligibility, or if the youngster signs with more than one institution, the denial of eligibility. But this provision recognizes that there may be perfectly legitimate reasons for the first circumstances, and even conceivably legitimate reasons, in a sense of a mistake or an inadvertence, in signing with two. The plan contemplates that an appeal may be made with limited factors to be considered under which release or at least amelioration of penalty provisions for improper signing could be achieved.

This has been one of the complications among the conference letters of intent, and for that matter in the interconference letters of intent—the youngster ends up where he didn't intend to go or he signs two letters. How is he going to handle it?

We believe this is likely not to be excessive in number, but even if it were, it is one of the factors that ought to be accommodated to make sure the opportunities to change one's mind for legitimate reasons do not lead to a penalty which is not aimed at a legitimate change of mind.

William J. Flynn (Boston College): On page 6 of the Preliminary Report we have the proposed amendments, and one particular amendment, namely "C" to the Constitution, to amend Article 3, Section 9, page 14, by adding a new paragraph (a) and relettering subsequent paragraphs as follows:

"Section 9. Principles Governing the Eligibility of Student-Athletes. An institution shall not permit a student-athlete to represent it in intercollegiate athletic competition unless he meets the following requirements of eligibility: (a) He must be an eligible member of the intercollegiate squad under the number limitations established in the Bylaws."

On pages 10, 11, 12 and 13, you will find the number of limitations. Page 10 says, in general, to be eligible to participate one must be

listed, and that is important. One must be listed as a member of the particular squad.

Now, when does a listed player count, and when does he not count against your quota? A listed player who counts is called a quota player, and there are five particular categories in which one becomes a quota player.

First, he must be recruited. That is under O.I. 100. He is recruited and is receiving financial aid, and his athletic ability has been a consideration.

No. 2. He has signed a candidate's declaration, or a comparable instrument.

No. 3. He has been provided a job in the summer or during the academic year through the intervention of a staff member or a representative of the athletic interests.

No. 4. He has been recruited and is competing on a varsity team, not the freshman team.

No. 5. He was not recruited but he is receiving financial aid and his athletic ability was a consideration. An example of this would be a boy who came to our university and went out for the football team, proved to be a pretty good football player; who was not recruited but we decided to give him aid.

Now, you come to a student who is listed, but he doesn't count against your quota. This is called an exempt player. He was not recruited and he is not receiving financial aid, or he is not recruited and he is receiving financial aid but his athletic ability was not a consideration. In this case the athletic director must have on file certification from the faculty representative, from the director of admissions and from the director of financial aid that his admission or his financial aid had nothing to do whatsoever with his athletic ability.

Next is a person who is listed. He does not count immediately, but he may count later. This person is called a temporarily exempt player. This is a student who was recruited but he did not receive aid, or he is receiving aid that does not have anything to do with his athletic ability, and it is certified by the three categories as previously stated.

On page 11 we find the annual limit for each academic year for initial awards. In football, if freshmen are not eligible, you have 30 initial awards plus five from the bank. However, the program would start off with 10 in the bank, and then you would also have the possibility of having five fifth-year players. The reason for five is not necessarily persons who have registered, but the fact that over 50 per cent of the students do not finish college in five years. There may be financial reasons, there may be injury reasons, there may be health reasons. Therefore, when freshmen are not eligible, it would be 30 initial awards, five from the bank and five that are five-year students.

When freshmen are eligible, it would be 25 initial awards, five from a bank that would start originally with seven and five five-year students.

In basketball it would be five initial awards, two in the bank and two five-year students. In basketball it would be the same whether freshmen were or were not eligible for varsity competition.

For other sports, on page 11 we list the maximum initial awards per year in the first column. We list the maximum additional awards from the bank per year. Then we have the maximum number of students receiving, being quota players, not only for four years but five years. That is 20 in baseball, which covers also the fifth-year students.

Let's talk about the bank. Let's say you only have the first four sports. Therefore, if you add the initial awards, you have 15 awards. The bank is one-third of those initial awards for those intercollegiate sports that you are conducting. There are 14 NCAA-recognized sports. You may only use 10 of them, or you may have 12 of them. So if you have 10, you see what the initial award would be, and you divide that by three, and that leaves your bank. Therefore, the first year starting out, if you have the first four, you would have 15, and you would divide by three and that is five, and therefore you would have 20. Therefore, that particular year you would be allowed to give 20 awards. But you cannot give in baseball in one year more than seven, and in cross-country and track you cannot give in one year more than nine, and so forth.

On page 12 is explained what a freshman squad in football would consist of. It explains what a varsity squad in football would consist of if freshmen were not eligible and if freshmen were eligible. In basketball and the other sports, it would be a similar procedure.

On page 13 it says a quota player who competes in both football and basketball shall be counted in both, even though he is a member of both squads. A quota player in two or more of the other sports shall be counted in one of the sports only. Therefore, if a boy is a track man and a wrestler, you can count him in either sport. You do not have to count him in both sports. If a boy is a football player and is to be counted in football and he is also a wrestler, he does not have to be counted in wrestling. But if he is in football and basketball, he has to be counted in both. In the other sports, if he does not play football or basketball, he can participate in two, three or whatever number of sports, and he only has to be counted in one of them.

The material tells you how to go about listing a player or listing a squad: "Each member institution shall compile a list of the squad members in each sport on the first day of practice and indicate thereon the status of each member in the categories listed above." Namely, whether he is a quota player, whether he is an exempt player or whether he is a temporarily exempt player.

"Each list shall be promptly filed in the NCAA office, or as to members of an allied conference, in the conference office unless the conference declines the responsibility. The lists shall be checked for adequacy and completeness of information. A supplementary list may be filed to add names of persons not initially on the squad, or to indicate a change of status from temporarily exempt player to quota player. A student-athlete's name must be on a proper, filed list to qualify him to represent his institution in intercollegiate competition."

In other words, if he is not listed, he does not play.

John W. Sawyer (Wake Forest University): It was just a year ago that we were standing before you talking about many of the same ideas. I am sure many of you consider this like a summer rerun of a TV program, with the same dull stuff and just a different commercial.

What we are trying to do is emphasize what has taken place since

last year. There has been considerable feedback, considerable further deliberations about these various ideas; and probably the greatest changes that have taken place in the thinking of the Committee and the Council have been in the area of financial aid based upon need.

To see how it works, refer to our Preliminary Report, page 13, Section 2, Determination of Financial Need, proposed Bylaws change.

The preamble of Section 2, in effect, says a student shall not be eligible in intercollegiate competition if he receives more financial aid than he would be entitled to on a need calculation basis.

Paragraph (a) requires each member institution to list with the NCAA a statement of how much it costs to go to that school—a statement of its educational expense, comprised of tuition, mandatory fee, room and board, the campus rates for double occupancy, required course-related supplies and books not in excess of \$180 for the academic year and incidental expenses at \$15 per month. The original proposal included \$30 per month, but this has been set back in the final session of the Committee and the Council.

Revised statements shall be filed whenever the cost of going to the school changes.

Part (b) is the major change. In the original plan of the Committee, the institution could award to anyone books and required course-related supplies up to \$180. That originally was to be given to anyone, regardless of need. Now in part (b) a member institution may award tuition and mandatory fees or part thereof to a student-athlete without regard to his financial need. In other words, the need calculation would not appear as long as he was getting only tuition and fees. But an award shall not cover any other part of his educational expenses except upon a showing of need.

The institution may award aid to cover all or part of the educational expenses other than tuition and fees by which the expenses exceed the calculated, expected family contribution. This obviously is going to be more expensive for the institutions.

Part (c) directs the Council to adopt a formula for determining the expected family contribution. The final report of the Financial Aid Committee included a proposed method for doing this. The Committee felt it needed to come up with a feasible plan for obtaining such information. The Bylaws changes do not lock us in on any particular type of calculation but simply direct the Council to determine procedure for establishing the expected contribution on the basis of income of the student, his spouse (if any) and his parents (or guardian), excluding wage or salary income of the student.

Most of the need calculation plans which are in use in some schools today expect the student to contribute a certain amount of earnings for some award. This is included in the amount that he is to receive. His amount is reduced by the amount anticipated from earnings. The NCAA does not propose to do this.

Part (d): "The Council shall approve forms to secure information needed to make the calculation of the expected family contribution. The form shall permit explanation of extraordinary situations which the student wishes considered in making the calculation. The form shall be submitted to the NCAA, or its designated agent, which shall determine the expected family contribution and advise the student of the figure thus established. The figure shall be revealed to such member

institutions as the student directs . . ."

This will not be revealed as the income of the family and will be sent only to those institutions directed by the student. It will not be broadcast generally. Nothing will be revealed as to the income of the family but only a given figure, which will say simply, "Your expected family contribution is \$1,500" or some such figure.

" . . . and the respective institutions may offer or award aid as provided above in accordance with the stated figure."

Part (e) requires confidentiality on the part of the NCAA or its designated agent. The designated agent, by the way, could be one of the established agencies for providing such services, or it could be some entirely different organization, but it would be some organization given a contract by the NCAA. This shall be kept confidential, except to the extent that the information may be material to questions of violation of NCAA requirements. In other words, the Infractions Committee could have access to this information if necessary.

Part (f) allows for a recalculation of expected family contributions in case of a change in the family circumstances.

Part (g) says that the award shall be applied first to any tuition fees that were not given. This would be the situation where the school will give only part of the tuition fees, and any need calculation shall be applied first to finish up the tuition, and then to the room and board, and so on, and the last thing to be given is the \$15 a month cash.

Part (h) enables an institution to use a procedure for calculating respective contributions other than the NCAA plan, provided that the aid the institution gives does not exceed the maximum amount which would be awarded under the NCAA formula. For example, if an institution uses the American College Testing Service financial program, it would be giving less aid. The school would be awarding less aid under that program than the NCAA program because the NCAA program is much more liberal.

Part (i): The Council may establish such further procedures as it deems desirable, adopt appropriate additional forms, fix fees for supplying forms or providing statements of the calculated expected family contribution, etc., etc.—a good housekeeping section. But the final sentence is very important: "Such acts of the Council may be passed on by the annual convention in the manner provided for review of interpretations in Constitution 6-2."

Any procedure set up by the Council for determining the respective family contributions will be subject to review by this convention. So you would not be turning over all these affairs to someone who would have absolute control over everything which took place thereafter.

The first several pages of the material you have just received include some calculations showing the effect of the changes in the calculations of financial aid based upon need. You see the name of the institution, a column that calls for tuition and fees and a column for the cost of room and board. These figures were extracted from catalogues of the institutions. I do not vouch for these figures any more than that they were copied from university catalogues no more than one year old.

By each college we have the cost to the college—not to the student but the cost to the college now—giving you the full grant-in-aid for certain expected family contributions. You see a horizontal line labeled

"Original" and another horizontal line labeled "New." The original means the original proposal which was printed in the final report of the Financial Aid Committee, which you received some months ago.

The original proposal had the need calculation applying the tuition, fees, room, board, \$30 per month, with books and supplies available to all students up to \$180.

Opposite Alabama, for example, if the expected family contribution was minus-\$135, which meant the student could receive \$135 in cash during the year, the cost of the original proposal to the University of Alabama would be \$1,566. That would be the total cost of tuition, fees, room, board, books, and so on and \$30 a month.

In the new proposal the need formula applies to room, board and books, \$15 a month, with tuition fees available to all student-athletes. If you go across the line opposite Alabama, you will see that if the expected family contribution is \$0, there is no difference in the cost to the University of Alabama for these two plans. If the expected family contribution is \$500, again there is no difference. If the expected family contribution is \$1,000, there is just \$12 per year differentiation.

Notice that the figure \$443 opposite New is actually the cost of tuition and fees. So it would cost Alabama at least \$443 from here on out, regardless of family contribution. At \$1,500 family contribution, the original plan would have cost Alabama \$180; the new one, \$443.

On the next line, Albright, there would be a substantial difference in cost to Albright if the expected family contribution were rather large, say \$2,500. Under the original plan Albright would have paid \$760 to give this student the full grant. Under the new plan it would be \$2,100. But the expected family contribution does have to get fairly high before there is an extremely large difference in the old and the new plan.

The latter part of the material includes tables for determining the expected family contribution.

The procedure for determining the expected family contribution involved submitting information from income tax returns, or equivalent sources, for adjusted gross income and allowable deductions—hospital expenses, interest paid and things of this nature—to get to the net income.

If the family had three dependent children with a net income of \$10,000, opposite the \$10,000 would be the figure \$425. That means the family would be expected to spend \$425 toward the cost of room, books and so forth. The tables have been adjusted just slightly in the light of allowing only \$15 incidental expense instead of \$30. This is essentially the same table used in the final report, adjusted upward by \$135.

I might call your attention also to page 82 of the Annual Reports, the minutes of the meeting of the NCAA Council at Chicago October 3-4. This meeting was devoted to a study of the Financial Aid proposal, and these minutes contain much of the thinking of the Council as the final proposal evolved from their work. You may want to read that for further background.

Chairman Barnes: Gentlemen, you may start the questions.

Robley Williams (University of California, Berkeley): It seems to me these financial aid figures surely cannot be accurate, and they are somewhat misleading, on the optimistic side, as though going to col-

lege didn't cost all that money. For example, Cornell University is listed as \$1,300. My son went there eight years ago and it was \$2,400. I doubt it has come down that much.

With respect to the state university, the figures apparently apply only to in-state tuition fee. If they are from out of the state, I think you slap on another \$1,000 in the case of the University of Southern California.

These are only examples, but I think the results are misleading, and the differential between the old plan and the new plan on average would be quite different than shown.

Mr. Sawyer: My only answer to that is that these figures were copied directly from university catalogues. I am not infallible, of course, and may have miscopied one. Cornell may be and probably is incorrect, but most of the others certainly would be very close to correct, and the final results would not be off all the way through.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, in the case of the state universities, many of them have distinct differentials between in-state and out-of-state tuition, and that may not have been shown in their catalogues but nevertheless it is quite real.

Mr. Sawyer: Also it is the case that many universities have provisions for waiving the out-of-state tuition for athletes, so that will balance out.

[Cries of "No!"] [Laughter]

Delegate: This question is addressed to Mr. Flynn. You mentioned a limit of five key members in the fifth year. What happens if the college is a five-year co-op college where 90 to 95 per cent of the students are on a five-year program? Would we be limited to just five students in the fifth year?

Mr. Flynn: At the present time you would be. It doesn't mean there could not be an exception made for such schools. The original committee had 10, and the Council moved it back to five. They thought 10 was excessive.

Mr. Cross: May I comment on that last question, too? I am not sure what type of five-year college that is, but if it means one of the five years he would just not be in school, you would never get to the problem, because he has four academic years.

Delegate: No, this is a five-year co-op college where the student is in college the full nine months in the freshman year, and the second, third and fourth year he is in college six months, working out in his particular field of college, and in the senior year he is back for a full nine months. Many of our students, because of the fall assignment, cannot participate, or many of them sit out their freshman year to get a good academic start.

Mr. Cross: I think your third, second and fourth years they are out a third of the academic year, and that answer still stands, as that adds up to one.

Delegate: They are out six months. They are not on a three or four-quarter basis. We go all the year round. Half of our student body is in for six months and the other half is working, and when the first half goes out the other half comes in.

H. Frank Leftwick (Tuskegee Institute): If a student can show he does not receive any financial support from his family, then wouldn't this affect the computation for his need?

Mr. Sawyer: Yes, it definitely would.

Mr. Leftwick: The case I am trying to point out is this: There was a gentleman in California who was in the \$60,000-a-year bracket. The year before his son went to college his father dropped him off his income tax and forced him away from the house. When he went to school the next year, there was no evidence that he was receiving financial aid from home, so as a result he received the full aid.

Mr. Sawyer: There has been considerable discussion given to that. Frankly, no one has the final answer. The Council and the Committee have given quite a bit of thought to it and more has to be given to it.

John Larsen (University of Southern California): Mr. Sawyer, I must back up Mr. Williams' comment about our institution. Our present mandatory fees and tuition for two semesters would be \$2,240. The room and board figure is correct.

Father Joyce (University of Notre Dame): In the definition of temporarily exempt player, who goes into the quota category when engaged in intercollegiate competition as a member of the varsity team, do you imply that he has to participate in competition against another school, or does he become a quota player as soon as he is on the varsity squad?

Mr. Flynn: He has to participate in actual competition. He can be on the varsity team and practice and still be considered a temporary player.

Father Joyce: Once he plays for one minute or whatever time it is, from that time forward he is a quota player?

Mr. Flynn: That is correct.

Father Joyce: In view of the Committee's limiting the number of fifth-year players to five, will this highly restrict the practice of red-shirting?

Mr. Flynn: We really didn't get too involved in the question of red-shirting. As I stated in my presentation, it was a question of the number of students who actually do go five years, for many, many reasons. There is a possibility, I suppose, that it could limit in some institutions what is known as red-shirting.

Father Joyce: In any event, that was not the intent of the Committee?

Mr. Flynn: That was not the intent of the Committee.

Father Joyce: For an exempt player, as long as he has received no aid and came to the college without being recruited, he could still play those three or four years and not be a quota player?

Mr. Flynn: He would not be a quota player; he would be a listed player.

Tom Parac (Montana State University): In the listings of awards, there is a column listing of maximum initial awards, then one of maximum additional awards and then the maximum number of quota players. What is the definition of an award? Is this any award you may have given, that you maintain, or is it a full grant equivalent that is referred to as an award?

Mr. Flynn: I believe an award is what is given to a person who is a quota player, irrespective of the amount of money he is receiving. Even if he is not receiving any money, if he is recruited or if he signs a student declaration, that would be an award.

Robert Whitelaw (Eastern College Athletic Conference): It is my

interpretation that if a golf coach talks to 20 prospective student-athletes in high school and they all happen to end up at this particular institution, he has to make a decision as to which three players it would be possible to have participating on the varsity golf team, and as a result the other 17 players would be denied participation on the golf team.

Mr. Flynn: He would have to apply Rule 100 to determine whether or not he actually had recruited the youngsters, and if he had recruited them and they fall within the quota number, he would have to decide which ones he would have listed.

Mr. Whitelaw: Then he would be restricted to three. Is that right?

Mr. Flynn: That is correct.

Mr. Whitelaw: There is a possibility the next year that he might have a sophomore included as one of the three in that particular year?

Mr. Flynn: He could.

Delegate: How can you consider it in the limitation when there is no financial aid given?

Mr. Flynn: Because he was recruited.

Delegate: Well, we are talking about financial aid. There is no financial aid. Why should he be considered in the quota?

Mr. Flynn: We are also trying for equality in recruiting. You may have a tremendous athlete who has all the finances and wherewithal, but he is recruited, although he pays his own expenses.

Delegate: That is not what we are concerned about. It seems to me the whole gist of this meeting is money.

Mr. Flynn: That is our fundamental problem.

Paul Dietzel (University of South Carolina): First, I would like to make a comment on what Dr. Jack Sawyer said in presenting the need program. I believe the need program was tried in one of our major colleges. I cannot speak for anyone except the coaches who were involved. They felt this was probably one of the most unworkable things they ever came into contact with. I think you will find a lot of parents declaring their sons are no longer members of the family. We will make liars out of people.

I know we are living in an age where everyone is guaranteed something without doing anything for it, which I am strictly opposed to. If we had, for example, two families living side by side and one family was on relief, they have one child, they have never earned a penny and are very happy to be on relief, and beside them is a family where the father and mother both work and they have a combined income of \$9,000, that would mean the son of the family on relief would get a free ride to the college of his choice, and it would cost the couple with an income of \$9,000, as I read your chart, \$955 to send their son to college. Is that correct?

Mr. Sawyer: Yes, that is right. That is the way it would work out.

Mr. Dietzel: I cannot see anything that could possibly be equitable about that at all. Since I am a football coach, too, I think it would be very difficult to coach a team where you have such ranges of scholarship aid. This is one of the problems coaches have found before. I think the biggest problem is that it is difficult to come up with an accurate income appraisal when you pin it down into a situation like this.

Mr. Sawyer: I agree with you, Paul. There is a philosophical ques-

tion involved in any type of need, and it is true almost all of the scholarships granted today, other than athletic scholarships, are administered on need. It was the feeling of the Committee, with the combination of saving money and setting up a better psychological climate in athletics in the universities of today, this possibly could be of some advantage.

Mr. Dietzel: I think one of the unique qualities of athletics is that it is still based on the boy's security and not on some ethereal paper idea which sounds great and doesn't work worth a toot. I think this is one of the things we have to guard in our athletics, because this is one thing we still have.

Mr. Sawyer: We are hoping we will continue to have it.

Eugene M. Haas (Gettysburg College): Some institutions have a form of giving awards determined by their president. If this legislation were to pass and become law in the NCAA, would the institutions be permitted to use their own plan for awarding scholarships?

Mr. Sawyer: They would be permitted to use any plan so long as they did not award more pay than they would under the NCAA plan.

Seaver Peters (Dartmouth College): In my own situation, with a very liberal need formula, the College Scholarship formula would demand \$1,475 more than the NCAA need formula. That was before the tuition change—\$1,475 more than demanded by the College Scholarship Service.

John E. Faber (University of Maryland): In some of these sports, the quotas are unrealistic, when you consider that the grant-in-aid is anything and the man who is recruited may get nothing. Some of these boys get a great deal because they are commuters. This is considered financial aid. It seems to me such an arrangement as this is totally unworkable.

Mr. Flynn: The Committee contacted the presidents of all the coaching associations, the chairmen of the Section Rules Committee and a substantial number of athletic directors, and the NCAA office compiled all the information and thought they came up with the best possible number. That doesn't mean they have, but this is the best available one.

Vanette W. Johnson (Arkansas AM&N): I think I have a little misunderstanding here. A quota player who competes in track and also football would be counted in both sports.

Mr. Flynn: He would be counted in football.

Mr. Johnson: Just football?

Mr. Flynn: Just football.

Max O. Schultze (University of Minnesota, Minneapolis): I would like to ask for clarification in this effect. If I remember correctly, in the mailing which was received about four weeks ago, on page 14, reference was made to the fact that the athletic awards shall be restricted to tuition and fees, and for the remainder to maintenance, room and board.

Now on page 14(g) I find this has been eliminated. Am I correct?

Mr. Sawyer: No. Where it says "The award shall be applied," that is a little confusing there. This is intended to take care of the case in which the institution decides not to give full tuition and fees to a student. Maybe they will give tuition and fees and then any further award based on need would be used to finish paying for the duration

of the tuition and fees before going to anything else. They would be entitled to give full tuition and fees to any student they wanted to, without regard to that.

Mr. Schultze: That is not spelled out. I would suggest this would be a very realistic solution, that you would save quite a bit of money, and I would suggest that a student who needs additional fees for his own personal maintenance, board and room and so forth, compete with all the other students for financial aid. In most instances the need program would be automatically reduced. He would stand in line with all the other students for financial aid at the financial aid office, and the athletic department would be in a much more defensible position.

Furthermore, it would eliminate the need to introduce a special kind of formula for the NCAA aid. I have severe reservations about the wisdom of institutions' special need faculty or student council. It would be much more effective if after recruiting an individual we offer him fees and tuition and for the rest of the maintenance he goes to the financial aid office.

E. McG. Hedgepath (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): I would like, first, to thank the Committee for the intelligent work they have done. I think the work they have done—in fact, the fact that the Committee exists—would cause us to recognize that inter-collegiate athletics are on a collision course, financially and philosophically. Why don't we face up to the real facts of the situation and try to simplify things rather than to complicate them?

The letter of intent was fine, but it was shot full of so many loopholes that it looks like a sieve. I remember the day before grants-in-aid. There was never anything more dishonest. The most dishonest thing they did was to grant aid.

I think the ideal of the principle of need is fine. I think practically it is impossible to administer on an equitable basis. Warren Brown will need two Philadelphia lawyers with him, and that is a conservative estimate, and each one of us will need one to help us live up to it.

Thank you. [Applause]

Howard Grubbs (Southwest Athletic Conference): I would like to address a question to Dr. Cross, in connection with the student declaration. I have had the rather odious chore of having to do with the interconference letter of intent for the past eight years, and one of the most pressing questions has been and is what to do about the youngster who signs the acceptance form and is admissible and decides to go to junior college, stays in junior college one year or two years, and then goes back to the senior college, not necessarily the senior college with which he first signed.

Has the Committee given any consideration to the solution of that question?

Mr. Cross: I think that is a detail that was not in the Committee's consideration. It was an oversight.

I would like to point out one additional thing in regard to the argument about cheating. People who want to cheat can do so now, but I don't think there is as much as people say. It is always somebody else who is doing the cheating and sometimes it is in their own institution.

A second thing is on the financial need aspects of the matter. If the family by one means or another gives financial information, or the

youngster gives financial information, that is inaccurate and cannot be policed, you notice that that information comes out with the same net result for every institution. The possibility of getting a calculation for Institution A that is different than the calculation given to Institution B does not exist, as Jack Sawyer outlined for you.

This method of arriving at the matter gets to a calculation on a single figure of expected family contribution. That is the figure each institution uses, the same figure in each institution, in deciding against their educational expenses what is the maximum basis of the award.

I would also like to point out it is one thing to talk about grants-in-need, full grants being necessary in intercollegiate athletics, as if it were equally applicable to all sports. As a practical matter, in many institutions there are relatively few programs in most of the sports. It may be that football or basketball or some particular sport is emphasized by the institution and that gets full-grant level.

But the problem is in reference to all sports, not only some money aspects but also philosophically. I don't think we ought to ignore that we are talking about all sports, not just football or basketball.

Bruce Allison (Union College): Suppose a given player has received some ten offers from different institutions, and on the fifteenth day the player has decided what school he would like to attend. I am concerned about the other nine prospects, and the mechanics. Has a method been decided that would release them to accept offers from someone else?

Mr. Cross: If you don't hear from the youngster within the time, of course, you are going to ask him what happened, and you will find out.

Mr. Allison: But you still would have tied up for those fifteen days the institutions who are competing.

Mr. Cross: Unless you were notified by the youngster himself that he would be declining your invitation, it could conceivably be tied up for fifteen days—not necessarily fifteen days—during the quiet time, ending at noon the following Friday.

Mr. Allison: I wonder if when he notifies the school that he would accept the offer, that also such notification could be given to the other institutions.

Mr. Cross: It is conceivable. Whether it would become so cumbersome as to make it extremely difficult to work out, I don't know. In our conference the procedure is quite close to that. When you try to set it across the nation, without one central office handling it, it may be something that cannot be worked out in the overall situation.

Tonto Coleman (Southeastern Conference): Could you give us a reasonable facsimile of the internationally, temporarily exempt student-athlete who is included, who receives financial aid for participation on athletic ability? Who would determine and how would it be determined? I cannot quite conceive of an athlete in that category.

Mr. Flynn: A coach is looking over his particular athletes and he decides he has so many ends and decides he is only going to take four—his other ends are not too bad but he cannot take them—according to O.I. 100 he has recruited. He might have paid his way to the campus. One of the particular boys may be the son of an alumnus, but this boy wants to go to this particular school and no other school, so the boy turns around and comes to that particular school. According to O.I. 100 he is a recruited boy, even though the coach did not offer

him aid. He may turn around and obtain aid from the financial aid office based on need. It may be that he does not have sufficient money and he may obtain an E.O.G. or some other form of aid. This boy has been recruited, and three officers can certify that his admission had nothing to do with athletics and financial aid had nothing to do with athletics; therefore, he is a temporarily exempt player. When he gets up to the varsity level and the coach is going to use him in competition, he then becomes a quota player.

Mr. Coleman: Is it possible or conceivable that he could be temporarily exempt for two or three years?

Mr. Flynn: He could be temporarily exempt for four years. There are boys who play on football teams because they like to go out and be part of the football team and that particular crowd, and they may never get into anything.

Mr. Coleman: How far ahead of the student declarations will the calculations be made?

Mr. Sawyer: This particular detail has not been worked out in full, but in planning the procedure that has been proposed, the idea was to have something that could be evaluated very quickly, and the NCAA in setting up the evaluation procedure will keep this foremost in mind—to get the information back to the school as quickly as possible, much quicker than can be done by some of the other services.

Mr. Coleman: Would it be possible or probable that a recalculation could be made from time to time?

Mr. Sawyer: I think that could be the understanding when the final regulations are adopted. There is provision for recalculation. I don't think the period of time for recalculation has been set, but it is my understanding it is any time.

Mr. Coleman: I don't suppose there is any conceivable method for job districts to enter into the table. For example, \$10,000 in my home is a lot more than it would be in Miami, Florida. Is there any way or any method, or has any thought been given to that? I would presume it might have some effect.

Mr. Sawyer: There was thought given to it, but no procedure was worked out on it. This sort of thing usually reflects itself in the cost of the institution in that area. Conceivably it could work out for the person going to a low-cost area as opposed to a high-cost area, and that might be some advantage to a school in the low-cost area, depending on the particular circumstances.

C. R. Gilstrap (University of Texas, Arlington): Under Non-Renewal of Aid, it reads: "In the latter event, the institution also shall inform the student-athlete that if he believes the renewal has been withheld for questionable reasons . . ." Can you give an example of "questionable reasons?" Would inability to make the team be a questionable reason?

Mr. Cross: This is designed primarily to let the youngster who feels he is aggrieved have an opportunity to have somebody other than the coach or the athletic director say whether or not he may continue. It has to be a relatively open thing. That has nothing to do with whether he plays. I would expect the ordinary committee, if he was merely unhappy because he wasn't making the team, would not feel that was sufficient reason, if that is all that is involved. He is doing the best he can, and so on. What it is designed to do is give protection in large

measure on the runoff time complication.

Mr. Gilstrap: It also says, "No offer of financial aid shall be made to a prospective student-athlete prior to the beginning of his senior year in high school." I assume that would be a verbal offer. Is that correct?

Mr. Cross: No.

Mr. Gilstrap: It is not correct? You cannot make a written offer until March 12?

Mr. Cross: That is right.

Mr. Gilstrap: Thank you very much. That is important.

Mr. Cross: Wait a minute. I have to put that right. You cannot use this procedure. You can advise him what you have in mind, either in writing or verbally, but the procedure which has the binding qualification not only on your institution but on what other institutions may do may not be initiated until the specified date.

Mr. Gilstrap: I say that is significant because in some states a high school player is immediately made ineligible if he receives any kind of offer. I assume it would be a written offer. It puts us in much the same position as the professionals who move in on some of our people.

Mr. Cross: I don't picture how these proposals would have any operative effect against that kind of local situation. Obviously that sort of situation would still have to be observed by the institutions recruiting in such an area.

J. D. Morgan (University of California, Los Angeles): I understood the initial thrust of the committee for the need program was to base the athletic grants on need. We started out with the total athletic grant-in-aid, and then the philosophy changed as to the tuition and the compulsory fee, which is a very substantial amount nationwide when you average it out. That was dropped from the need program. Yet at the same time, if I understand the quota system correctly, the philosophy on a recruited athlete, regardless of whether he supports himself or his family is able to support him, is that we are keeping him in the quota system even though he is not costing us any dollars except recruiting dollars.

I have difficulty dovetailing these two philosophies. One is a substantial amount of money. The other could be an infinitesimal amount of money in regard to a specific athlete. How do you reconcile this philosophy?

Mr. Sawyer: You will recall at the last Convention the question was raised concerning differentials in costs between the private institutions and the public institutions, in the case of students whose expected family contribution falls half way between these two columns, and the student ends up going to the low-cost institution for considerably less money than he could to the high-cost institution, even though he had the same expected family contribution.

In the minutes of the Council it says: "There was discussion about the possibility of equalizing the anticipated contribution in order to eliminate the difference in cost between public institutions and private institutions. It was suggested that a maximum contribution be established (e.g., \$2,000) or that every institution be allowed to provide tuition and mandatory fees, thereby applying the family anticipated contribution to the balance of educational costs." The Council considered those two possibilities and simply went with the tuition and

fee.

That does not answer your philosophical question.

Mr. Morgan: No, it does not answer my philosophical question, nor does it answer my geographical question. I wonder who presented the eloquent appeal on this, and could he just as easily have presented the eloquent appeal on geographics, or the eloquent appeal that the recruited athlete who pays his own way does not cost as many dollars.

There are so many factors to this, that it appears we are at odds with our philosophy on the total need picture.

Mr. Cross: I think there are different philosophies in this, in reference to need factor and the numbers factor, and you can get a conflict where the one does not seem to match at all, and you have put your finger perhaps on the most important one. The geographical question, it seems to me, is one that basically is unmanageable, and whatever program is involved, if it is operating on a national basis, there are going to be certain elements of simplicity about it which inevitably will have some of these kinds of disparities.

A. A. White (University of Houston): I think much of the discussion has proceeded on the idea that the general practice is to grant assistance to students based on need. That may be true from the numerical point of view, but it is not completely true. There are two basic theories on grants-in-aid to students.

One is where the student wants something the university has but is unable to get it, and the university administers aid to him that will enable him to get what he wants.

There is a separate and distinct idea, namely when the student has something the university wants, and the university extends aid as an inducement to that person to help the university get what it wants.

I think fairly the student-athlete comes under the latter category. Those of us in the pure academic side of the university may be a little coy in admitting this, but we want that athlete because he will provide something which the university wants. They want it because it is an educational experience they want him to participate in at their pleasure.

Now we are suggesting that we take a person who falls in that category and put him over in the first category I mentioned, and at the same time we are doing that we are putting a hardship on him. The average student who comes to the university—if he wants to use his spare time to go out and earn, regardless of the earnings of his parents—has the time and the opportunity to do so. But the student-athlete does not have that privilege. We ask him to come in and provide us something we as a university want, but we at the same time take his time and take him out of the labor market where he could go out and earn money. We are also depriving him of the opportunity to become an economically independent, self-reliant individual, which the other person can do.

The student-athlete is not here to speak for himself, and I think we ought to look at it from his point of view, and try to see it from his point of view, in the decisions we make.

I think there may be some things more important than cutting the cost. One of them is being fair to the student we seek to bring in as a student-athlete under those circumstances. [Applause]

Earle Edwards (An officer of the American Football Coaches Association): I would like to make one or two statements; not new ones but perhaps unknown to a good many here today.

We have conducted a poll about the policies proposed before the changes were made about the need factor. We polled 119 of the schools in the University Division and had a wonderful response of some 107, and the vote against adopting these plans for using the need factor was 9 to 1. I mention this because anything that changes our policy as much as this would do, so quickly, should be put in a better atmosphere I think. It is going to require, to be acceptable, rather complete acceptance and cooperation of the football coaches themselves, and it would be difficult to do a very good job of it if nine-tenths of that particular group of coaches were not in favor of it and could not go about it with enthusiasm.

Robert W. O'Connell (University of Massachusetts): My confusion is with the use of the quota player. Under the table on page 11, it says: "shall not be quota players on the squad in excess of the number shown in the column of the table headed overall maximum." We go to the top of page 13, and it says: "A previously listed quota player who has not graduated shall continue to be listed on the squad until his eligibility has been exhausted as a result of application of the five-year rule or of competition in the maximum number of permissible seasons."

To use a ridiculous situation, if eight student-athletes were recruited for golf, they are all freshmen, played, they are not quota players, they can all stay in school five years (that's possible) and they all decide to quit golf at the end of their freshman year, it says they have to be listed as quota players until either the five-year rule has been completed or their maximum playing season. How does that coach maintain a golf squad in effect for the next four years, except using exempt players?

Mr. Flynn: I read it and I found the same difficulty in understanding it, but I agree with you. Maybe someone else up here can give the answer. If a player is a quota player as a sophomore and decides not to play in his junior or senior year, I don't know why he should be kept on until the five years. I had nothing to do with this particular writing. I presume it is an error.

Mr. Cross: It is not an error. It is an attempt to make a common bank system, and the idea of the quota player limitation annually works here as it does in the football and basketball proposal, the difference being in football and basketball you work only by one-year segments all the time. The fifth-year aspect is taken care of by the special limit, so obviously if somebody became a sports player—if not in his fifth year, at some earlier time—there could be no more in the state of limitations.

The requirement that you cannot replace them is in here, both in football and basketball on the one side and the other sports on the other. It is a protection against the runoff.

In the first place, your illustration would not work, because you could not have more than two quota players as freshmen under the list to start out with, so you would have five to work with, and two more to work with the next year.

The second proposition is that you probably should do a better job of

recruiting in the first place.

Wade Stinson (University of Kansas): I have advanced this argument before, and lost it. Harry Cross just touched on it. I notice on page 11 that all the sports except football and basketball have an overall limit. I may stand alone on this, I don't know, but if an overall limit is good enough on the minor sports—let's say the nonresident sports—why isn't it good enough for football and basketball?

If you have an overall limit, I see no reason for maximum additional awards in any one particular year.

We have a trend in our institution, and I cannot believe that a lot of other people do not have attrition also. There was mention about people quitting golf. If you have a limitation each year, how do you ever catch up? And I speak primarily about football or basketball.

I will try to answer my question to you. If we are upset with the runoff problem—I am not, but if we are—it seems to me we have a built-in test for the problem in the young man taken before the committee before he is cancelled, and also especially if a man is involved in runoff, it seems to me you can catch up with the institution very shortly.

Why wasn't the overall limit proposed rather than so many people per year?

Mr. Flynn: Consideration was given to the overall limit by the Committee, which spent many hours on it and felt with the one-year rule having an overall limit was not compatible. It is the opinion of the Committee if you did away with the one-year rule and had a four-year rule, you could have an overall limit, but the Committee felt there should be a one-year limit and therefore felt you could not have a one-year limit and have an overall limit.

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): In the Big Ten Conference we provide our grants-in-aid on a one-year basis. We used to have this kind of proposition with regard to banking and so on. We have abandoned it and provide an overall maximum allowance for grants-in-aid in terms of basketball and football and it seems to work very well.

I am not quite sure I understand why the Committee feels the two are incompatible. Under our circumstance, by having the overall limit we also have avoided all these problems with quota players and listings because the number is not affected by the students who are not aided.

If you really want to get at the question of cutting down on expenses, why isn't this the simplest way to do it?

What I really would like to know is whether the committee made the decision or whether it, too, was changed somewhere along the line, and any further explanation you would like to provide.

Mr. Flynn: No, the Committee made the recommendation, and the Council stayed with it. You may be able to control it in the conference, but they felt there was a danger if you wanted to bypass the one-year scholarship, you could find some way to eliminate them and just add some more. We felt there was too much of a change in this method. There are many people who believe in the quota system.

Francis Smiley (Colorado School of Mines): What we are discussing this afternoon is far from new. About nine years ago the Long Range Planning Committee was instituted in the NCAA. Its membership consisted of college and university presidents, commissioners, coaches,

athletic representatives, the whole gamut of the college community.

These people at their first meeting were talking about what we are talking about today. The Long Range Planning Committee could see this coming. I was a member of that first group and on the committee for many years, and at every meeting the subject came up.

It is my firm conviction, whether this proposal goes through or not, some proposal of this nature must, simply because of the economic pressure intercollegiate athletics are putting on the rest of the institution. So we are facing up to this.

I would like to say I think the Committee has done a good job with the proposition, and having examined it for these many years, there are many, many ways to do it and no way satisfactory to everybody.

I would also like to make a comment here for the consideration of the Council, now that the Committee is out of operation. When legislation of this sort is passed, as sooner or later it must be, we should as an Association make a very concerted effort to inform and educate high school athletes and high school coaches about this, so they will not be caught up in some of the questions that have been raised this afternoon, about whether the boy does this or the coach does that. I think it is our job to keep them informed and educated on what we are doing.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): I want to join in commending the Committee and the Council in its efforts in this direction, because I feel that sooner or later we are going to have to solve this problem, and I think it is only by discussion such as this and by the advocacy of the Council and others that we will finally get to a solution.

In regard to limitation and fellowship numbers, I feel these limitations should be equal across the board to the membership of NCAA and not catch only 15 or 20 per cent of our institutions.

I am very much concerned that this legislation as it is now written will virtually kill partial scholarships, and from my standpoint and my institution's standpoint the partial scholarship is one of the most significant things accessible to our faculty. From that standpoint I am greatly concerned, and I would like to see some way of setting up an equivalency of partial consideration insofar as numbers, so that partial scholarships would be appropriate and not have a single unit in every instance.

My question concerns the one-year award. I felt when I first heard of this—three cheers, it's a good move. But when I began to read the fine print I find, insofar as our situation is concerned, we would wind up with virtually a four-year scholarship program because our scholarship committee is made up of an equal number of faculty and students. The result would be, in virtually all the appeals made to such groups, the award would be made on a four-year basis. I think if we can be provided with very specific guidelines insofar as what would be an appealable case, we might have some effectiveness in this regard. But as it is now, we are getting ourselves into a worse situation and we will wind up with a four-year scholarship.

Mr. Cross: I think that may be a very, very useful suggestion; to try to identify types of things which would fall into the questionable reason category. Undoubtedly that sort of thing would be handled by our O.I. mechanics. This is essentially the procedure that is used in

some institutions now, that are on a one-year grant. It is a matter of protection for the youngsters, and I suppose in part that it is going to be a question of whether the athletic department can get the message across to the scholarship committee that they are trying to run a reasonable operation, not only from the financial standpoint but the educational participation in athletics. If the committee is entirely unsympathetic with intercollegiate athletics, I guess you are going to be stuck with the four-year grant, whether you want it or not.

Harold W. Lahar (Colgate University): Is the complexity of the quota system necessitated by the award being based on financial need? In other words, in an institution such as ours, and I think there are many others who operate as we do, with a 2,500 student body and some 600 athletes involved in various competitions, all of these people have not been recruited in the context of that word. On the other hand, most of them have been contacted in some way, either by a coach or in the broad interpretation of the university and the community.

So I find it very difficult to see how institutions such as ours could comply with the quota system as it is written. I am wondering whether or not a more practical approach to it could be found; whether a quota system that appeared to be determined in a much more simple form would be more acceptable without financial aid.

In other words, if an institution is limited to 30 grants-in-aid per year, 30 athletes receiving aid per year, period, it would seem to me that would be a much more simple way to approach it.

I find it hard for an institution such as ours--when we are on the need basis--to comply with the quota system as it is written.

The other question is on page 14, paragraph (d). The mechanics are explained for providing the means and analyses for the various institutions involved with the individual athletes. On the College Scholarship Service, the student-athlete pays for this service himself. Has there been any discussion about who is going to pay for this particular service if the legislation goes through, because this is a very costly operation? And in conjunction with that, what about those of us in areas which require College Scholarship Service, who are trying to attract a boy to our institution who is also talking to someone who is on the NCAA need basis? Does that mean that that institution or individual is going to pay for both of those?

I don't think you can provide that service without some kind of fee that the student or the institution is going to have to pay.

Mr. Sawyer: Considerable discussion has been given to that, and I think the original idea was, if possible, to try to set it up with no cost to the student. Whether it would be too expensive for that remains to be seen as we get into the contract phase, but it is the intention of the Council to hold the cost to the absolute bare minimum, certainly under no circumstances to try to make any money from the process.

There has been talk about allowing the institution to pay that, but this is something that will be determined as the specific mechanics are set up.

I will agree, too, that the complexity of the quota system is definitely tied in with the need calculation because of the difficulty of equating, say, two equivalent partial scholarships to one full need scholarship or something of that sort.

Ernest C. Casale (Temple University): It is my opinion that this organization is divided among those who favor numbers and those who are in favor of need. Somehow or other those who are on need cannot live with the numbers, and those who are on grant cannot live with the need.

I have talked to a lot of people about this. It seems to me those who are on need are having the problem on the freshman level. I don't think the problem exists above that as much as on that particular level.

If you are on a need program, I think the school should determine its policy, whether it is on a grant program or a need program. If it is on a grant program, it will go by the numbers as presented. If the school is on the need program and at the freshman level, it should be given an equivalent. If the school's educational equivalent is \$4,000, and in football they are allowed 30 scholarships on the numbers system, then they would be allowed \$120,000 expense on the freshman level. It is immaterial to me how many athletes came in on that; there might be 50 athletes on partial scholarships. This would give those people working on the need basis the opportunity through that freshman year, and I think then it would follow that they would use the numbers on the years following that. I believe that might be a solution.

Harvey Chrouser (Wheaton College): I have a small school of about 1,800. When this was presented I thought there would be no way we could possibly be in violation. In going through it I see that we are. We have gone on the basis of need; money available. It is a policy that we work at hard. For example, you do this: If a boy makes application to the school and he has athletic ability, we will contact him. So I would say that if we want him for some sport, such as cross-country or track, we would be in violation. These boys come to the institution and aren't given financial aid, a good many of them, but they are recruited players.

This I think puts our Association and our institution in opposition to what we have long held, that athletics are good. We think it is good to have them come out. We like to compete. This is impossible for schools of our type. There are a lot of schools like mine that are not in violation. When you go down through this, if they have any size at all and do the recruiting we do, they simply contact the student and say, "We have a good school, come to our school."

Edward Steitz (Springfield College): When we first got into this, it was my understanding that we recognized we were on a chaotic course because of finances. I thought we were going to attack this problem and do all we could to cut the cost of running intercollegiate athletic programs in our institutions. I was hopeful it would be based on the amount of money we were giving out and the number of grants.

I share the view expressed by Harvey Chrouser. I happen to represent an institution 2,000 in size, and we have many, many violations that will occur, if this ever passes. The majority of these youngsters are not on any financial aid whatsoever. They have been recruited, yes. This is the principle of the student body at Springfield College, and of a major in the Division of Health and Physical Recreation. We think these educational activities are very meaningful to them. We further believe in sports as academic discipline. It is a vital part of

our program at Springfield College, and I am really concerned that the quotas that are going to be placed will do a great injustice to our program. I know we could not live with them.

I am all for cutting down the give-away program, the run-away program, giving grants and so on. I support that, but I am a little concerned that we have gone away from the basic proposition with which we started.

Lloyd P. Jordan (Southern Conference): I want to compliment the Committee for the fine job they have been doing. At the same time I stand here in surprise and amazement because I have reviewed over the years the minutes of the various organizations—reviewing in 1961 the meeting in Denver, the Conference of Conferences—whereby a straw vote was taken on the same problems that you have here, regarding financial aid, by the group at the round table. It was a brain-storm at that time, and it was voted down. My amazement is because this group here today has been one of the first groups that has round-tabled the problems that are now to be voted on at this convention.

The letter of intent has been in effect for eight years. There have been 40,000 signees. And during that time there have been three problems. I wonder how much time the Committee spent in reviewing the problem of the letter of intent handled by the commission.

We have a problem in athletics—all of us know that—financially and every other way, but we also have some great organizations in this athletic business. The American Football Coaches Association representatives stood before one of our meetings when we were going to vote on certain things, and they made objections. Why weren't they presented at a round-table session with the Committee that was going to present the problems, because they in turn would be able to solve some of them? We also have a great organization of athletic directors who from time to time have been bypassed, and they are the men who are responsible for the problems that we have, and they are gentlemen who can solve them if they would sit down with all the groups together and work them out.

One gentleman said we should go back to the high schools and prep schools and educate them. Personally I think this is the group that needs education. So forget financial aid and come back to a commitment of education.

Robert Woodruff (University of Tennessee): I believe representatives from the coaches' organization are here. Isn't Eddie Crowder a member of the Committee?

Mr. Flynn: Eddie Crowder was an adviser. We had four coaches advising us on the Committee, and we had the football coach at Rutgers as a permanent member of the Committee. Ed Sherman, who was one of the greatest football coaches on record in the country, who is no longer a coach but is head of the College Football Committee, was a member of the Committee, and I think the NCAA did try to have the coaches well represented, either on the committee or in an advisory capacity.

Mr. Woodruff: For the benefit of all the delegates, I certainly would like to hear from Ed Crowder.

Edwin Crowder (University of Colorado): I have listened to all that has been said. I served as a consultant to the Committee. There was a representation made of the point of view of the football coaches by

Earle Edwards, who indicated the football coaches took a vote and were opposed to the program. As a result, I have not felt that the coaches were expected to speak so much as the delegates were to express their point of view to see what could be worked out. My point of view has not changed. I concur with the manager of the coaches who expressed himself as being in opposition.

I also might make an observation that whatever is evolved in the Association during the course of events with the efforts made by the Committee, I believe the Committee has been very sincere in its efforts and very thorough.

At the same time I think something has been learned during the meetings that is very meaningful to the NCAA. It has become quite apparent that it is impossible to come up with any solution that can govern 650 institutions.

It is my very definite impression that the solution to a great extent is the division of the NCAA into legislative groups, as proposed by the Long Range Planning Committee. As soon as that is done, I think we can discuss the problems of the coaches associated with each of those groups, and I think we can make definite headway to what we have been trying to do today with delegates representing those whose budgets range from \$20,000 up to several million dollars. In my opinion, it would be very wise for us to divide the NCAA into closely related bodies that can very closely relate to their particular problems. I think that would be progress, and as a football coach I frankly am delighted that headway seems to be in the offing. I think that will make a much more workable NCAA.

William Wall (MacMurray College): I, too, am one of the consultants on this Committee, as president of the National Association of Basketball Coaches. There were four of us—representing the baseball coaches and the wrestling coaches in addition to football and basketball—and these are the questions we brought to the Committee and that is why we were consulted in three or four meetings.

We also polled the basketball coaches of the country and they do not want the need factor at all. They feel it is unworkable. Of course, we are told it is because we don't want it to work. I think what Eddie Crowder said is true. We don't want this thing to work because it is chaotic. We all realize there is a great deal of cheating going on now with the grant. Many people have said this is the smartest, the most honest thing we have done. We are deeply concerned about the unethical recruiting in the need factor. We don't want it at all.

A. C. Jordan (Bowie State College): We have spent much time discussing the cost of athletics today—financial aid, quotas, student aid, etc. I am wondering if students themselves shouldn't have some interest in this particular problem.

William Rohy (Ohio University): Of course, we are all speaking from our background. Being in the Big Ten from 1956 to 1963 as a basketball coach at Northwestern, we worked under these programs. Frankly, in my entire collegiate career I felt I had never faced such suspicion and subterfuge and so on. Many people say that was because the Big Ten was an island to themselves. I don't believe that.

I wonder if you ever talked about making freshmen eligible, which I never thought I would stand up and say because I always thought they ought to have that year to get ready for college, that freshman

year. But they are doing it in other sports and it seems to be working. And then cut down the number of grants.

I realize I have many good friends in the football coaching field who would disagree with this. But by cutting down—say we give football 100 grants over a four-year period, and basketball 15 grants over a four-year period, with the freshmen eligible, and no other grants—at Ohio University that would save approximately \$100,000 a year. Perhaps that figure in no way approaches what you would like to approach in savings, but in getting into this need situation, it just seems the situation is so unpalatable for so many people. Have you ever thought of a program of that kind?

Mr. Flynn: We did talk about discussing the question of their being eligible, but we thought that was the responsibility of another group. Of course, it is on the agenda for Saturday for voting. It was a year ago.

Also, when you limit the number of grants in basketball to 15 and in football to 100 and so forth, I don't see how that would be compatible to people on the need program. With the people on the need program, you are talking about the number of people on a squad who are receiving aid. There would be many, many more, of course, receiving aid on the need basis. These things were discussed, and we were charged with coming up with something to save money.

If the membership were divided, according to the discussion, there is a possibility then we could come up with a group with 15 grants per year or 100 in football because the people in that particular group were more similar. But when you have such a tremendous organization as we have, with so many different types of universities, it is very difficult to come up with that solution.

Edmund Joyce (Notre Dame): In discussing the possibility of a total quota for basketball and football rather than breaking it down by years, it was said earlier that this is not compatible with the recommendation of the committee for one-year scholarship. I am curious as to the Committee's thinking in regard to this one-year scholarship because in the past we have been great advocates of the four-year plan rather than a one-year plan for the simple reason we wanted to avoid any temptation being placed in front of the coaches for running off athletes.

It seems much more equitable to the students themselves to commit yourself to the four-year period.

Apparently conditions have changed somewhat in athletic circles, and your Committee has come to the conclusion a one-year grant would be more feasible. I have yet to hear explained the rationale of your thinking; why you have come to that conclusion. I believe this question does tie in very specifically to the problem.

Mr. Flynn: You say most of the people have favored the four-year grant and there seems to be a changing feeling about it. At the ECAC convention we had some 200 members and they took a straw vote on all of these issues, and I believe the one that received the greatest vote was the one-year grant. This amazed me, but the membership seems to have a tendency now to favor the one-year grant over the four-year grant.

Mr. Cross: In recent years, in the Infractions Committee when I was on it and the years I served as chairman, and this last year on the

Council, it was very, very disturbing to see the youngsters who were using their institutions, who probably have no honest desire or expectation of contributing to the athletic program, and still they are primarily there because the institution wants them there to contribute to the athletic program. Probably one of the purposes of the one-year grant is for the protection of the institution.

The "reasonable grounds" for not being deprived of renewal is aimed at the protection of the youngsters, and still with the one-year grant having some reasonable chance of protecting the institution.

I forget what the institution was that had probably more people on the four-year plan in the particular sport than they had on the squad because of the abuse that was involved from the youngster's standpoint. I am afraid that is a growing thing, because the attitude seems to me to be growing, that not only does the world owe him a living but the athletic department owes him a living, whether or not he ever comes within the confines of the athletic campus.

Edwin Crowder (University of Colorado): I would strongly support the one-year plan. The fact is that the student-athlete has two general safeguards for him in the program. He has, first, the reputation of the university and its athletic program. Secondly, he has the right to appeal to the scholarship committee if he feels he is being unjustly dealt with, while the athletic department under the four-year grant has no such appeal. If the young man wanted to withdraw from competition after one week, he would still have the four-year grant. I think it is really an invitation to the young man who is unprincipled to accept something which his background really entitles him to but then not participate. I believe also we sometimes had the runoff factor in the program because there was not enough light focused on it.

[The session adjourned at 4:55 p.m.]

UNIVERSITY DIVISION ROUND TABLE

Friday Morning, January 7, 1972

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m. in the Regency Room, Samuel E. Barnes, Secretary-Treasurer of the NCAA, presiding.

Chairman Barnes: All of us realize that those who do not progress must lose sight of the future. The NCAA Council has recognized the fact that the organization cannot stand still. For this reason the Council asked Dave Swank to look into the possibility of reorganizing the NCAA. Dave and his committee have done this, and they will report to you on the progress as well as the philosophy of reorganization.

Intercollegiate athletics for women has always been on the horizon, and because of the interest of the women in intercollegiate athletics, we have a speaker on this particular topic.

I would like to introduce those individuals who will give you the information on these topics.

Miss Joanne Thorpe, director of women's physical education at Southern Illinois University.

Claude Gilstrap, director of athletics, University of Texas, Arlington.

Robert C. James, commissioner, Atlantic Coast Conference.

Ed Czekaj, director of athletics, Pennsylvania State University.

Dave Swank, professor of law at the University of Oklahoma.

Our first speaker will be Dave Swank, who will give you a philosophical overview of legislative reorganization.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): Last August the NCAA Council met and the issue of legislative reorganization was considered. At that time they appointed a special committee to consider this reorganization. They asked the committee to come back in October with some type of tentative recommendation.

Some of you may not be aware of who is presently serving on this committee, which the Council appointed. I was selected as chairman.

Dick Bowers, athletic director of the University of South Florida.

Ed Czekaj, athletic director at Penn State.

Claude Gilstrap, athletic director at the University of Texas, Arlington.

Bob James, commissioner of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Ed Sherman, athletic director of Muskingum College.

Since that time we have added Stan Marshall, who is at present chairman of the College Committee and athletic director of the University of South Dakota.

We have, we feel, a broadly based committee, and for those of you who may complain that faculty people sometimes predominate on NCAA committees, you will notice on this one they are all athletic directors or commissioners, except for myself.

Where did this legislative reorganization idea come from? As you realize from yesterday and from almost every convention we have had in the last several years, the financial aid program has been studied. As we went forward with this financial aid study, we be-

came more and more aware of other problems within the NCAA and the need to consider those problems concurrently with the need for financial aid program.

The most important of these has become legislative reorganization. As we have continued to consider this matter, I am more and more convinced that as an Association we have probably put the cart of financial aid before the horse of reorganization, and that maybe we have to reorient this position and put the horse before the cart again, and put reorganization first.

The need concept has made us aware of the divisive interest which exists within our organization. It is difficult with certain types of By-laws or regulations to apply the same rules to the University of California, Los Angeles, as you might apply to Union College in New York. I think many of the general concepts and principles will apply equally to all, but when we get to some of the questions our student bodies are different, our athletic programs are different, and it is difficult to mesh these two together. So we do have some need for reorganization, and I believe the time is ripe now.

We have all heard when 1,600 was considered, when the freshmen rule was considered, when the need program is considered, that one group of schools is trying to put something over on another group. I don't really believe that is true. What is true is that many people are looking at their own programs, what they believe is best for their college athletics, and each is representing its particular belief or philosophy. We get to the place where we do have this divided interest, and we have to have some rules that will apply to one and not to the other.

We also have to think when we vote on any reorganization: What will this do to the NCAA? Willis Stetson of Swarthmore College is quite concerned, and I think justifiably so, that a division will destroy the Association. Before we should ever vote for any reorganization, we should consider that fully, because I believe that the National Collegiate Athletic Association should continue. It should not be divided in such a way that it might come apart. We have to continue to have an association that represents the diverse interests of all of us, and in the reorganization we have to figure out a way of doing this without destroying the whole. If we can't, maybe we should keep the whole, but that is what we are really looking at today.

Your committee, when it met in October to consider reorganization, decided to come out with a bare-bones plan of reorganization, and we reported this back to the Council with a recommendation that the matter be referred to the Association for its consideration. The Council agreed that the members should have some right to speak very early in the game on whether such a reorganization was necessary.

We presented this bare-bones plan to the membership by way of a memorandum and questionnaire. A number of the responses we received said, "We don't have enough detail." We realized you would not have enough detail to answer some of the questions, but we wanted to give you the thinking of the committee to find out if this Association felt that the time was ripe, as the Committee did. This questionnaire went to all the faculty representatives and athletic directors of the Association. It also went to the officers of the allied

conferences. We sent out 1,200 to 1,300 questionnaires. We received 758 responses. You have each been furnished with a summary of those responses.

We received a response of greater than 50 per cent. I think this is significant. Your Committee felt that substantial response was itself an indication that many of the members realized there was a problem within the Association. So that memo may not have served to solve the problem, but at least it began the thinking upon it.

I said a few moments ago that we had a bare-bones plan and we wanted to know what your thinking was.

On Question 1, which was, "Do you favor a reorganization?" we had an affirmative vote of approximately 81 per cent.

On Question 2, about our bare-bones plan, we had a response of approximately 80 per cent.

On Question 3, about the Constitution applying to all institutions, we had an affirmative response of 85 per cent.

I think you can see the very strong response of the Association. Maybe not everyone realizes all of the implications of the plan, but they did realize that something should be done.

We are here today to fill in the flesh on this bare-bones plan of reorganization by again giving you the opportunity to let your Committee hear what you want in reorganization or if you want reorganization. If you seem to be in favor of some reorganization, your Committee will get back together to reconsider this and try to put into effect what the membership of this organization wants.

I will go over very briefly what your Committee has proposed. We propose an organization that will have a single Constitution that would apply to, and we hope unite, all members. This Constitution would contain the basic tenets of our organization—amateurism, student participation, institutional control, academic standards and probably some basic principles of financial aid. Obviously it would cover membership organization and amendment.

We would then propose division of the Association into some grouping more compatible with their existing educational philosophy, their enrollment if that is a relevant factor and their athletic programs. I don't think you can separate these and say, "We will just do it on the basis of athletic programs," or just do it on the basis of educational philosophy. If this division of the Association will have any meaning, it must contain all. That, of course, is going to be one of the very difficult problems.

We would have bylaws that would apply to each of the separate divisions. The constitution, which would set up the general principles, would be adopted by a majority vote of each division. In this way each representative body would have the right to say whether to adopt or change this constitution. The bylaws would be adopted by each division acting separately.

Now you get down to how this should be done—whether you would have a convention that would vote upon the constitutional questions first and then upon its bylaws, or whether you would have a joint meeting and separate voting. The latter may be best, because each group can hear what the other thinks about their own bylaws, and there may be matters which would be adopted by one division which another division, after hearing the discussion upon it, would find very

relevant for their group. Again, this is a part of the plan on which we do not have any final decision at this time.

Obviously, as a part of this reorganization, the Council will be affected. In the questionnaire we have a substantial majority favoring a reorganization of the Council but not as large an affirmative group as in the other questions. I think we must consider a Council reorganization if we are going to have separate divisions so that each division might have some greater representation.

One of the surprising responses to the questionnaire was that a majority opposed geographical redistricting of the Association. One of the reasons for this, I suppose, was the lack of detail in our bare-bones plan. The Committee will still have to consider that.

I want to mention one thing concerning the resolution which you will have before you tomorrow. We have three resolutions on what is called the "Special Convention" of this Association.

The first resolution will be one that would allow you to vote on whether to consider at a special convention legislative reorganization first, and then financial aid. Your Council realizes if such a resolution were adopted, it would be very difficult to reorganize the Association at a convention. I think what would have to occur, if this type of resolution were passed, is that your Committee and the Council would have to come up with a very definite plan six weeks or two months before the convention would be called. We would then present it to the membership and let the membership decide, if reorganization were to take place, what division you would place yourselves in, so when you arrived at the convention you would know that if reorganization were voted you would place yourself in Division A, Division B, Division C or whatever they might be called.

The second is a resolution just calling for reorganization. Obviously, if a convention is called for that purpose, it would be more simple because then at a later time or at the next regular convention you would have greater time to replan your Association.

The third is for financial aid only. Those are your options tomorrow, and you will have a chance to make those decisions.

Some may be fearful that the convention might be called at an improper time. The Council has suggested that if a convention were to be called it would be during the week of May 28 through June 3, when most of the people will be through with their spring term, and before the summer session has begun.

Also, in order to reduce travel expenses as much as possible, the convention would be placed in the Central Northeast area, at some place near Chicago, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Cleveland, where the travel would be cut down for the majority of the schools.

I think there is one further matter that would have to go into the Constitution. That is a commitment on the part of the university to adequately support the Association if such a reorganization plan were adopted. I will ask Bob James to discuss that.

So without any further comment, I will turn this over to Bob James, and then Ed Czekaj, and when we are through we do solicit your questions. Thank you.

Robert C. James (Atlantic Coast Conference): In our preliminary discussion about reorganization, the great concern of the College Division members of our Committee was that we would provide the

necessary funds to conduct the championship programs which are so vital to that division. We found a great misunderstanding about the source of revenues from which the organization conducts its operation.

I would direct your attention to the general income of the Association. The membership dues provide slightly less than 10 per cent of the budget. The National Collegiate Basketball Tournament for several years has provided approximately 63 per cent of the budget; the College Division Basketball Tournament approximately 5 per cent; and so on down to the various investment programs, etc.

This year for the first time there will be an assessment against the football television revenue, an additional 1½ per cent, to be placed in the general operating funds of the organization.

I think this becomes a matter of great concern to the College Division members when you look at the breakdown of the Association, which represents approximately 242 institutions in the University Division and 414 in the College Division. Our commitment to all of the members of the Association is that we intend to provide the funds to conduct this organization in the best possible manner, and that there will be no entrenchment in any of the College Division programs.

Edward M. Czekaj (Pennsylvania State University): After two years of deliberation in the ECAC, at our last annual meeting we passed important legislation by restructuring the ECAC into three groups for voting purposes. The purpose of the grouping was to provide greater compatibility through group alignment, to provide representation through group structure in the affairs of the conference and to provide the mechanics for voting procedures so the decision on an issue or proposed legislation may be enhanced by group voting.

The criteria for the selection of the groups included the sports tradition, the scope of the program, financial aid policy, the academic and athletic philosophy and undergraduate male enrollment at each institution. The groups were determined by the self-determination of the institution; where they wanted to belong. We kicked this around for some time as to the various categories, whether it be two, three or four, and we ended up with three, and called them Group A, Group B and Group C.

For equal representation on the council, we decided that each group would have five appointed to the council, or a total of 15. At one time we had as high as 20. That was cut down. We decided if we used the formula of the 2-2-1 ratio to get this thing rolling, for example, Group A the first year would have two, Group B, two, and Group C, one; the second year Group A, two, Group B, one, Group C, two; and the third year Group A, one, Group B, two and Group C, two. I could go on and on.

Claude R. Gilstrap (University of Texas, Arlington): This Association has long had two categories in which we place the championship events—the National Collegiate Championship Events and the National College Division Championships—the only difference being one of degree or different level of competition. Later we chose by institutional self-determination the headings, University Division and College Division, and we did this by sports. Then we adopted the philosophy of institutional self-determination on all sports, an all-or-nothing proposition. If we chose the College Division for our institution, then it was College Division in all of our sports, and the same

with the University Division.

This Committee submits for your consideration the possibility of the advantages to be gained by some further division and procedure whereby schools of a like nature could join to the mutual advancement of each.

The feeling of the Committee was to continue to stand together in all areas of common interest, but there is perhaps some advantage to be had by voting in groups in other areas.

We were certainly encouraged by your responses. By a vote of almost 8 to 1, you endorsed the idea of a common constitution for the NCAA. I think as never before we do need to band ourselves together as a group. The inroads being made by professional athletics are certainly common knowledge to all of us. By a vote of 3 to 1, we expressed the need for separate bylaws; in other words, the same general philosophy with certain specific differences in background.

At the present time we have two types of classification. One is by self-determination; the other is by National Collegiate Sports Services, based upon the quality of the schedule the school plays in the sports of football, basketball and baseball.

On the basis of institutional determination, at the present time we have 242 University Division members and 414 College Division members. Additionally, those schools in the College Division who participate in football have further divided themselves into College Division I and College Division II. Presently in College Division I there are 151 members, and in College Division II 326 members. However, National Collegiate Sports Services recognizes only 119 colleges as being major football playing colleges. So then it would follow that some 120 members of the University Division find themselves classified as College Division in the sport of football. I am sure that the same thing is true in basketball and also will be increasingly true in baseball.

This classification by the Statistics and Classification Committee at the level of competition has merit because of our dealings with the news media. However, for the purpose of legislative reorganization, the Committee felt it need not concern itself with this other classification, and that a classification based upon institutional self-determination would be quite satisfactory. Their feeling is even stronger in the light of your responses.

Item 6 simply says: "If the NCAA were divided"—understand the division would be along the lines that we talked about, always with the common constitution—"If this division should be accomplished, in which division would you place your institution?" If you consider only the responses of the athletic directors, because of the possibility of duplication, 167 indicated a preference for the University Division, 116 indicated a preference for College Division I and 185 for College Division II.

The responses of the athletic directors who actually indicated a preference represented some 70 per cent of the total membership, so if we increase each of these by approximately a fourth or a little better than that, we certainly would have an equitable distribution of membership insofar as a workable arrangement is concerned.

The next item asks the question: "If the NCAA were divided into four divisions, in which division would you place your institution?"

Again, summing up the responses from the athletic directors only to avoid the possibility of duplication, 97 chose University Division I, 74 chose University Division II, 89 chose College Division I and 193 chose College Division II, which again gives a workable distribution. In the light of your responses, we feel that we have received at least some sort of mandate to pursue this further until we get different directions from you.

Chairman Barnes: As we said in the beginning, this was an exploratory situation, so even though you have heard from members of the Committee, they are also soliciting your help and your suggestions. At this time, the floor is open.

Edwin Cady (Indiana University): My tenure in the NCAA is much longer than that of many of you. I am in my tenth year. When I first attended these meetings I was appalled, frankly, by the position. My sense was that the people simply didn't make much sense. Then in going through our annual book with its proposals, trying to understand the rules in all their panoply, I was thoroughly confused and I thought how poorly the legislation was written, until I had the experience to try to write some legislation for it myself, and that wasn't any better than anybody else's.

A lot of this would be really pretty funny if the price were not so hard for all of us; that is to say, our confusion leads to real trouble. It has seemed to me for a long time that one way out of the trouble and the confusion was to join like to like, to have an opportunity for the universities to make a program and to talk to one another on their own grounds, and try to solve their problems on that common ground, and so on for the other groups of the NCAA.

I think it is a promising start this Committee is bringing forth. I hope we will be able to endure with patience and real hopefulness all the changes that will be made in trying to arrive at a really viable federalized NCAA that makes sense, because up until now, as the saying goes, if you are not confused you don't understand the thing.

Francis W. Bonner (Furman University): This has to do with the divisions. I have been looking at the first round playoff of teams in basketball. It appears to me that nine of them would be major institutions in football and nine probably would not, but they all have been big-time in basketball. Let's say Villanova. I don't know whether they have big-time football or not, but let's assume they do not. They certainly have big-time basketball and would want to be in the NCAA playoffs in basketball. Would they have to choose a division, College Division I or College Division II, because of their football and not be able to compete for the national championship in basketball?

Mr. Gilstrap: The difficulty springs from the fact that we are using two different standards for classification, one by institutional self-determination, and the other a standard set by National Collegiate Sports Services, which rates teams according to the degree of difficulty of their schedules. In other words, to be a major team in basketball I believe the stipulation is the team would play the majority of its games against other major teams. Of course, that leads one to wonder how the first one got in the division. I don't have the answer for that. An answer must be provided because if we keep people solely within these three or four categories, as you may choose, as determined by institutional self-determination, and we do not permit playing across

these lines as far as championships are concerned, we have created a whole new ballgame.

Mr. James: In viewing this matter, however, it does bring one to the conclusion we may have to give consideration to the number of championship sports in which the institution participates, so it would not then come down to just one. This is one of the thorny problems we have, and certainly it is going to come up. We just have not proceeded that far in our thinking yet, because we wanted to find from you today whether or not we should proceed and hopefully obtain some additional information with which to proceed.

Mr. Swank: We anticipate competitive grouping, based on the type of competition. Many institutions will have a major sports program, except maybe they don't have football. So Villanova or Marquette, if they want to have a major program in all sports, to compete on a University Division level in all sports, we could foresee that they would still be in University Division 1, or Division A, whatever name you wish to place upon it. We would anticipate that if there were a division selected by this institution, that all of their sports programs would be conducted at that level of competition, and there is a voluntary commitment.

However, if an institution wishes to select a lower level, there would at least be some review by the Council or some other body of the Association to make sure that its program was in keeping with that level of competition. If not, it might be asked to change its division selection.

There is one other comment which might be made here—and this is very preliminary. Suppose you have basketball in two University Divisions. You might proceed through your playoffs and then have a University Division championship when the University Division I team and the University Division II team would play one another. You could do that in soccer, basketball and a number of other team sports. That is a possibility.

Let me ask one question here: Would you favor two divisions, three divisions or four divisions? We would like some clarification, obviously without a great deal of thinking on your part. I would like a straw vote by your standing.

How many here would favor one University Division? Just raise your hands if you will, those favoring one University Division. Now those who favor two University Divisions? All right.

[The result of the straw vote was not announced, but it seemed to the recorder to be about fifty-fifty.]

J. W. Roberts (Abilene Christian College): The thing that occurred to me was very much like the question just raised—how this would work in terms of conferences. In many of the conferences across the country, there is not uniformity in either major or college competition. Some of the institutions determine for themselves if they are still in the College Division for, say, football. If the groups were governed by separate bylaws, this would mean there would be two different meetings with different rules for scholarships and different things of that sort. Has the panel thought in terms of how this would fit into the present conference situation across the country?

Mr. Gilstrap: I can see no problem as far as football is concerned, because you do not play for national championships at any level in

football. There seems to be little inclination on the part of the institutions to do that.

I can see where there can be great difficulty in the area of basketball. I think National Collegiate Sports Services is necessary, because of our relations with the news media. I think there is great validity in rating people according to their schedules. I think we need to preserve that. But so long as we have these two methods of classification, I believe we are going to run into conflicts on certain occasions which at the present time we do not have.

Talmadge Hill (Morgan State College, Baltimore): Our membership was with the CIA for a number of years. We had 18 different institutions. A detailed study of that situation was made and we found great differences—variables in philosophy, variables in educational programs, variables in the quality of the program produced and variables in population. Wherever you have numerous variables, you are going to have a problem of bringing them into a single unit.

It was the thought of the several institutions in the CIA that had agreement in philosophy, facilities, program and population that we would bind ourselves together under a single umbrella, in complete accord and agreement with the Constitution of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and by self-determination attempting to get into the groups that we desired to be. We made every effort to comply with every regulation established.

With this mass of humanity varying from 700 to 1000, we are going to have a problem in attempting to bring them together where there will be unanimity of acceptance. So it seems to me that this reorganization is absolutely necessary, but I think the first thing we must have is the National Collegiate Athletic Association as the umbrella and the Constitution and Bylaws must be carried out.

As to our determining where we stand, the ribs of the umbrella might take on University 1, University 2, College 2 and College 1. But it seems to me it would be more helpful if there could be a selection by the institution that would be more likely to be homogeneous than any other kind of proposition.

We believe we can live with the national organization's rules, regulations, etc., and we highly endorse the reorganization, with the hope it will divide itself into University 1 and 2 and College Division 1 and 2.

Ernest Casale (Temple University): I think it must be remembered that the NCAA Bylaws come first and that each conference has its own rules, and presently that is related under the new plan and you cannot set policy as indicated here.

As I understand your skeleton plan, the Constitution would be amended by a majority in each division. It could be amended in Division 1 by a large majority, in Division 2 by a large majority and could be defeated in Division 3 by a small majority. I think that might be a problem. You might have two-thirds majority over all and lose it by one vote in one division. I think that is something you might consider.

Mr. Swank: This is one the Committee has considered. One reason we proposed the idea of its being passed by the majority of each division is it will prevent the problem we have had where one group of schools has said, "Somebody pushed something we don't want

down our throats." If Division A wanted something and they couldn't get it through the Constitution, maybe they could put it in their own bylaws for them to operate under as a division, but leave it out of the third division which didn't want it. We would think they could put it in their bylaws if they felt it was very important but leave it out of the Constitution.

Mr. Casale: The other question I would like to ask has to do with the bylaws. You have separate bylaws for each division. You can have quite a lot of problems that way. I wonder why we couldn't have one set of bylaws and a breakdown within the various articles of the bylaws pertaining to the various divisions.

Mr. Swank: I think that is a question of form rather than substance. If Division A, B and C had bylaws that were identical except for a few areas, that would be very appropriate. If there were substantial differences, I would be more in favor of separate groups of bylaws for each area.

Mr. Casale: I only say that because a lot of people here are saying, "I hope we don't divide the NCAA." This might be one way to handle it. I hope we would keep many of our rules for all.

Mr. Swank: This is one reason I suggested when we talk about bylaws or even when we vote upon bylaws, we do it in a unified meeting where each can hear the other's point of view.

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): I would like to suggest that when any legislation is adopted in the bylaws by any of the other groups, whether you have three or four, this legislation adopted by one of the houses must be brought to the attention of the others. In this way the bylaws would be more uniform for all groups.

On the constitutional question in the past I proposed that there be two houses. At that time we didn't have quite the complex structure and competitive arrangement we have now. The thought then was that the legislation adopted by one house would be considered by the other, and if adopted by a two-thirds majority of both it would become a constitutional provision binding on both. It is possible that some consideration might be given to that kind of question in terms of required majority for any common constitution.

I think it is apparent if we adopt any kind of reorganization that we must have a common constitution binding on all houses, whether it be two, three or four. Only in that fashion can the NCAA speak with a unified voice.

I have one other rather incidental point. I wonder if the Committee has considered the problem of the Memorial Day holiday on the dates Dave has mentioned. That may be a problem in terms of transportation. I think also many institutions will have their commencements at that time. I wonder if you thought about the possibility of either putting it off perhaps until the second week of July or changing it to a little earlier date, putting it early in May or April as the alternative to the date selected. I think it would affect a large number of people.

Mr. Swank: The dates that I mentioned are really tentative. I think one problem of moving it to an earlier date is that it is going to take some time, if these resolutions are adopted or any one of them is adopted, to prepare the legislation and get it out in advance. I think the dates of April or early May are out. For those people who are faculty representatives and teach during the summer, to miss a day

or two of classes during the regular term is hard enough, but to miss a day or two of classes during the summer with the accelerated schedule is almost an impossibility. That is one of the reasons we have left the summer out. We have tried to pick a time that we felt was best for the whole Association. It is not a fixed time. Obviously, it will be looked at again to try to decide the best time. If people have comments about it, we will be glad to hear them.

John E. Kane (University of Arkansas): I think everyone would agree that some constitution is necessary if we are to have more than one division. However, I think we would be wise to agree that beyond the common constitution the various groups would have substantial autonomy. A proposal such as having a common set of bylaws, where any action taken by one group would have to be considered by another group, is really trying to have it both ways, to have autonomy and not to have autonomy.

Ruel Foster (West Virginia University): In the proposed reorganization will there still be a plenary session in which the common legislative rules will be passed, or do you propose that the separate groups will take care of the legislation?

Mr. Swank: I can tell you our ideas at the present time. There would be a common session for constitutional adoption. I think one session for the adoption of bylaws might be appropriate so each side can consider and hear the other one. It may be that is impossible. We are still considering it. We would like to hear your comments.

Mr. Foster: The people I talked with believe we should retain the strength of federalism at any cost; that lacking this, the NCAA will lose real force and power. We certainly feel that the unified business session is something we should retain. If you lose it you lose much of the real value of the NCAA.

Mr. Swank: After the meeting is over and you go back home, if you have comments for consideration by this Committee, whether or not we adopt the resolution on these special conventions, your Committee and I would urge you to send your comments to the NCAA office, or you can mail them directly to the University of Oklahoma.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas): The point I would like to make that concerns me a great deal is on the operation of a session where we adjust our respective bylaws of the divisions. I have been quite concerned that there hasn't been available to the NCAA in the past a committee of the whole, to consider matters where there are divisions of opinion. A committee of the whole is entirely desirable to arrive at a considered opinion of the group. I would hope this could be done in the revision of the Constitution and subsequently in the divisions establishing the bylaws. The organization could operate for a while as a committee of the whole in arriving at such documents for the Association.

Chairman Barnes: We would like to move into the second part of our panel discussion, concerned with the matter of intercollegiate athletics for women. At this time I am very happy to present Joanne Thorpe, director of women's physical education of Southern Illinois University, who will discuss "Intercollegiate Athletic Competition for Women."

Miss Joanne Thorpe (Southern Illinois University): I represent the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. This association

is the offspring of the Division for Girls' and Women's Sports of the AAHPER. We have been involved in providing intercollegiate competition for college women since 1965. We began this venture at the suggestion of our men colleagues. We have staged eleven National Championships since March 1969. We staged six last year and we will have seven annually from now on. In our championships we have had about 1,800 participants. The championships are in badminton, basketball, golf, gymnastics, swimming, track and field and volleyball.

Our eligibility requirements are very strenuous, notable among them being our disallowance of any scholarships based on athletic talent.

A distinct contrast between our Association and NCAA is the organizational structure of our Association within an educational association, the AAHPER. Our Association is autonomous, nevertheless, within this framework, and as in the NCAA the member schools have the determination of action through their votes.

The Division for Girls and Women's Sports, which has been initiated with the Association, has adopted the following policy relative to women playing on men's teams:

"The Division for Girls and Women's Sports subscribes to the belief that teams for girls and women should be provided for all girls and women who desire competitive athletic experiences. Funds, facilities and staff should be available for the conduct of these programs. While positive experiences for the exceptional girl or woman competitor may occur through participation in boys' or men's competitive groups, these instances are rare and should be judged acceptable only as an interim procedure for use until women's programs can be initiated."

You will note that the thrust of the statement is to encourage sufficient programs for women, but not to discriminate against capable women where programs do not exist. Unfortunately, many administrations are still in the uninformed state of believing that women exist only to perform the supportive tasks in athletics of cheering, drilling and waving pompons. Because some of our early women pioneers in women's sports saw many of the evils of intercollegiate athletics and took a stand against the involvement of women, contemporary women are still bearing the "sins of the fathers." We are daily accused of being against athletics, whereas in truth we are against the evils that are often associated with athletics, principally the exploitation of talent for notoriety which is of questionable value to the individual involved but may help to renew the contract of the coach.

The DGWS has no particular opposition to the contemplated NCAA decision to allow women to participate in the men's national championships. We realize that few could qualify and that for those who could, this may be a quite worthwhile experience. However, the procedure for becoming eligible, in my opinion, involves some difficulty. The woman would have to be a regular member of the men's team throughout a season in order to qualify. This implies that an early decision would have to be made to try out for the men's team as opposed to the women's team. Until a woman has established her superiority among women athletes, she does not really need competition among men. When she has excelled among women, she may

need the greater challenges of competition against higher-skilled males.

We believe that our Association which was developed by and for women is better equipped than the various men's organizations to recognize and be sensitive to the needs of women.

The contemplated NCAA position of allowing women on men's teams is legally tenable but has little value beyond its good legal ring. Mr. Gangwere, the NCAA counselor, stated that discrimination in this case is against women as a class and that because as a class women cannot compete physically with men, a change of the rule could not change the fact. Mr. Gangwere further has stated that "the classification of separate male and female athletics is a reasonable one that should be sustained by the courts" and that "this classification is one made by society in general that has been adopted by NCAA." I might add that the decisions of the courts thus far have indicated no particular pattern.

This view was expressed by Mr. Gangwere in January, 1971. The increased heat of June, 1971 inspired a new outlook. In June, Mr. Gangwere began to imply that there exists some "divine right of NCAA" to regulate women's intercollegiate competition and stated that by failing to regulate women's athletics it "fosters any existing deficiencies in opportunities for competition among women."

I appreciate the opportunity to be able to assure you that any deficiencies which exist in programs for women can best be overcome by members of NCAA supporting the women's programs which are already in existence and are striving for recognition back home. The deficiencies could not be overcome by NCAA initiating a program for women in its member schools.

Our Association has initiated explorations for cooperative relationships with NCAA, NAIA and NJCAA. We are most interested in effecting arrangements by which we might become affiliates with these men's organizations. In this affiliation we cannot, however, afford to give up the autonomy which we have presently. We refuse to be dominated by outside groups, but we are eager to work cooperatively with them.

It is impossible to legislate allegiance. This fact would become very real should NCAA decide to attempt to control women's sports. The court cases now anticipated might truly occur and the defendants might be the same people—the athletic directors, the coaches and the college presidents. However, the plaintiffs would probably not be women who want to participate but the women athletic directors and coaches who are already providing appropriate experiences for women.

Dr. Lucille Magnusson, chairman of our Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, has suggested at least four reasons why NCAA should not attempt to get into the control of women's sports.

"1. This would break down the present unity of all women participating under one set of policies and through one set of championships.

"2. An operational program already exists with established policies under AIAW to which the women feel an allegiance and to which they are used to looking for guidance.

"3. The basic history and philosophy of women's programs has been, and is, to have programs for women administered by women.

"4. Competition for women is not ready to be organized according to membership of the school in a male intercollegiate athletic association."

A fifth reason I might add is that court decisions have not been clear in either direction.

In conclusion, I would like to say we are providing competitive experiences for women at local, regional and national levels. We see great strength in cooperative agreements with NCAA, and we are ready to explore these possibilities.

Edward M. Czekaj (Pennsylvania State University): Let's look at the history of intercollegiate athletics for women. With the exception of a few areas—Metropolitan Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, D.C. and other isolated situations—there was a minimum of intercollegiate athletic opportunities for women until recently. As a matter of fact, as recently as 1960 in many areas of the United States the very thought of varsity competition for girls was frowned upon.

ECSS appears to be the only organization which has been concerned about sports for girls and women over the years. In the early '50s, I am told, they studied their philosophy and realized if they were truly to serve every girl this must include the highly skilled. The highly skilled individual had actually been deprived of a satisfying experience within the school framework.

In the mid-'60s the guidelines for intercollegiate athletics for women were published. For the past decade there appears to have been a considerable growth of competitive opportunities for college women both on the school meet level and through the state, regional and national championships. The guidelines for such programs seem to have come from the ECSS and the CIAW and then have been further developed and adopted within each institution as it was appropriate.

The women now have an institutional membership organization in the form of the AIAW, which you have heard from this morning.

Are the problems in intercollegiate athletics for women the same as those for men? I am certain there are many similarities, but in addition it would seem there are many unique areas. What do you know about the programs for women in your institution?

At Penn State our varsity program for women started as an extramural program in the '60s. We have been pretty well oriented to intercollegiates, as you well know, but even at Penn State we are not ready to call the program intercollegiate or varsity for the first two years.

We have grown from a competitive program in a few sports to an intercollegiate program in eleven sports for women. On the basis of our past experience, we have found there are many areas in which we can help the women—the mechanics of travel, lodging, meals, information and assistance, insurance, institutional regulations, medical examination and so forth.

Are we administering the program? Indirectly, yes. Directly, no. We have a woman coordinator of women's athletic programs who clears the budget and problem areas with them. She is responsible for dealing with women coaches and along with them establishing the policies under which our program is operating.

It would be impossible for the details of this program to come through my office. I would be the first to recognize that my experience

has been completely with men's programs designed for men by men. I understand that women have many specific concerns that are different from the men's, and I am delighted not to have to worry about this type of detail. With the movement for equality in society, it certainly seems more sound, both philosophically and practically, to have the women establish the philosophies and policies for their own program.

In addition to having the overall administrative design which closely links the men and the women, we have a good working relationship between the two. We are also fortunate to have separate facilities, so there is not the constant conflict for a given floor area. However, we also share facilities. On many occasions the soccer teams and basketball teams use the women's gymnasiums and vice versa. We held the ECSS gymnastic championships in the Recreation Building. The sharing of facilities does not seem to be an impossibility if there is a cooperative attitude to start with, so that consideration is given first to the students involved in both programs.

Initially our program limited the number of contests to six sports. Now this has been changed to a maximum of eight in each sport. Whether we can increase this will depend on the finances available. We have eleven varsity sports for women and we have a budget of approximately \$35,000, which does not include salaries. Whether we can increase this program or add additional sports at this particular time, I do not know.

In the 1971 season we had a total of 200 girls involved in eleven sports—field, hockey, basketball, lacrosse, softball, golf, rifleman, fencing, gymnastics, swimming and tennis.

The financing of this program comes under my budget.

One major advantage of this cooperative arrangement is when a question is referred to me, I know that it has been screened by a woman. This is a considerable time-saver and also helps to assure that the most knowledgeable individuals are involved in making these estimates.

Is there a need for us as an institution or the NCAA to be concerned about the legal question, about equal rights, about the problem of discrimination by not allowing women on the men's teams? It would appear that if each institution offered a sound intercollegiate athletic program for women students, most of the highly skilled females would be sufficiently challenged and satisfied through the dual meet schedule and the existing regional and national championships for women.

This should relieve the anxiety on the part of the school as well as the NCAA. How can we help the women's intercollegiate athletic program? We can truly share our expertise with the women as their programs begin and continue to develop. We can encourage financial support for such programs so that similar opportunities are offered to both male and female students on our campus.

We could find out about the programs in our respective institutions, and the NCAA could help its membership in publicizing the championships so that we would all be more knowledgeable.

Your institutions can and should have the same pride in your women's intercollegiate programs as you do in the men's programs. With a reasonable amount of support and understanding, I would speculate

that these would cause you fewer headaches.

I have spoken with the women who administer intercollegiate athletic programs, and I would like to share with you some of their thoughts on why the NCAA should not offer intercollegiate athletic programs for women.

One would be a breakdown of all women participating under one set of policies and one set of championships. The women's intercollegiate athletic program is still quite young, and it will develop on a more sound basis if the total program operates under one administrative body. There is no need for three types of rules for championships, as would be the case if the NCAA, the NAIA and the NJCAA offered such programs. If one of these groups began to sponsor a program for women, all three in all probability would join in.

Second, there is already in operation a program with established policies under the CIAW to which the women feel allegiance or to which they are used to looking for guidance. This association, even though it has been in existence only four years, has established six national championships. The women's intercollegiate athletic program is shifting from the CIAW to the AIAW, which will be on an institutional membership with elected officers and elected representatives from nine established regions in the United States.

The basic history and philosophy of the women's program has been to have programs for women administered by women. The women basically support the ECSS, the CIAW and the AIAW. Historically, women have not always supported intercollegiate competition. In the course of the past five years, great strides have been made in shifting their point of view to one of acceptance, and this applies to the highly skilled girl as well as to the total program.

One of the chief concerns is that intercollegiate programs for women would follow the same pattern as those for men, and this women have feared. If the NCAA were to take over the intercollegiate programs for women at this time, it would be my guess that a larger percentage of women would strenuously object and refuse to participate in such a program, which could result in a lack of competitive opportunities for the highly skilled group.

Competition for women is not ready to be organized according to the membership of the school in the male intercollegiate athletic association. Generally, this would increase the cost of the men's programs far beyond the reach of the schools. The competition would force the schools of like membership over the edge. Women's programs are not ready for this type of organization. If the women wish to continue with the cooperative relations, this can be done between the CIAW and the NCAA. The women appreciate the help and guidance and suggestions that have been freely given over the past years.

I don't think women should compete in NCAA championships except in possible isolated cases. They prefer to stay within their own realm of their program. There is no doubt in my mind that they want to run their own program. If the NCAA tries to control their program, you can expect confrontation with the women, and I don't think this is the time for it. I know there would be a strong resentment by many of the leading women athletic administrators if the NCAA would attempt to control their organization.

Today you are darned if you do and darned if you don't. If the

NCAA interferes by preventing women from competing against each other, there could be a justifiable complaint of discrimination. If, on the other hand, the NCAA prevents female athletes from competing in NCAA championships, this could be justifiable as a complaint of discrimination, also.

I believe a compromise of some kind of affiliation would be in order, and this should be worked out gradually between the NCAA and the AIAW.

Chairman Barnes: George Gangwere is legal adviser to the NCAA, and I would like to ask Mr. Gangwere if he will present some thoughts and observations that I think might be of interest to all of us.

George H. Gangwere (Attorney at Law, Kansas City, Missouri): About a year ago, Mr. Byers asked me if there were any potential legal problems arising from the fact that the NCAA precluded participation by women in championship tournaments. I studied this question and concluded there was a potential grievance problem. I decided there could be a justifiable claim on the part of a woman student-athlete that she was being unjustly discriminated against contrary to the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment of the Federal Constitution.

This comes about, in my opinion, by virtue of the fact that the NCAA is charged with administering intercollegiate athletics for all of its members, and yet it has no regulation, no program for the benefit of women who may want to participate in intercollegiate athletics, and in fact excludes them.

The Supreme Court has never held that bylaws discrimination based on fact is necessarily unconstitutional. It has invariably held that any such legislation in discrimination between the sexes is valid if it can be supported by any reasonable purpose. In this light I believe the Supreme Court would not hold that it is unconstitutional to prevent women from participating in men's events. I do not believe most women want to participate in men's events.

The real problem, as I see it, is the fact that women have no opportunity to compete against each other in intercollegiate athletics. They do not have the opportunity because the NCAA does not make it available. If this is the problem, then of course merely admitting women who are qualified to compete against men in their competition does not answer or end the problem. As has been said, there will not be very many women who can qualify in any event.

The problem as I see it for the NCAA is to adopt a program which will give the same opportunity to women who desire to do so to compete in intercollegiate athletics. It is a difficult problem, but I guess that is what we have to do.

Chairman Barnes: You are now free to ask questions.

Charles Oldfather (University of Kansas): I would like to ask Miss Thorpe a question. Our institution has experimented with a move toward some support of the women's intercollegiate athletic program, by the athletic department in our case, a separate corporation. Does your national organization have any precise position on the desirability of this or any such position; any conditions under which this support will be accepted?

Miss Thorpe: Support from the normal budget of the university?

Mr. Oldfather: No, by the intercollegiate athletic department. Our

program is separately budgeted and self-supporting. Now, if the women's intercollegiate athletic program of the University of Kansas comes to us for support, does your national organization oppose that or are they in favor of that?

Miss Thorpe: We have not explored the question of what sources the funds of the women's program come from. I think it is intended to be an institutional decision, because I know of many instances where women's programs are still funded in the older method of activity fees. I do know of some women's programs where the money for the women's programs comes from the athletic fees, where the men's money comes from. So our Association has really taken no particular stand on this because we haven't yet seen the necessity for it.

Mr. Oldfather: If I understand the thrust of your remarks, it was that it is your inclination to have quite a separate fund from the organization. If there is a general seeking of support of the intercollegiate athletic program for women from the men's intercollegiate athletic program, it seems to me that your national organization would run the risk that eventually the control would move in the direction that you would not like to see.

Miss Thorpe: You can be sure we are looking at any policy that would bring that about. I think the mistake is often made in the university. When it is an athletic fee, it is never said that it is an athletic fee for men, but the assumption is that it is only for men. We believe the athletic fee should be for both men and women.

I am speaking purely from the standpoint of my university. We should not designate it as just for men, but also for women. At the same time I do not think that because it is a fee that traditionally has been under the administration of the athletic director, it means that a woman could not administer that portion of it. I think it is truly the desire on the part of our Association that the women's athletic administrator should now have control of the funds, regardless of where they might come from.

Robert Peck (Williams College): I understand the provisions of competition in the NCAA on championship events, but if this rule would be in the Constitution prohibiting women from participating on any level of team, would you still hold that this would be sustained by the Supreme Court? What if a regional association has in its constitution that women may not participate on intercollegiate teams, thereby denying women a certain right in the institution that they have paid for?

Mr. Gangwere: Your question, I take it, is if the Constitution of the NCAA were directed solely at male athletes, then would we have such a problem. My answer is, no, we would not have that problem. But let me say this is basically a problem of the institutions, in my opinion. They are the ones who have to meet the charge, as it were, but the institutions at this time have turned it over to the authorities directly in intercollegiate athletics, to the NCAA, so it has become a problem of the NCAA. If the NCAA abrogated this authority, then it would revert to a problem of the school, in my view.

Mr. Peck: I am trying to find out the difference in how the NCAA and the ECAC attack the problem. Women are not allowed to participate under the terms of the ECAC constitution, whereas in the NCAA it is only national championships. If a woman would bring a lawsuit

saying this was a denial of her rights under the 14th Amendment, what would be your opinion on this kind of case? Would this be the same, or would it be different as far as the NCAA is concerned?

Mr. Gangwere: As far as I know, a conference is merely a group of schools, so I go back to the proposition that it would be the schools that would have the problem. The same thing would be true with the NCAA if it were not charged with the responsibility of regulating that way.

Mr. Peck: Let us assume that I have a woman who wants to be on the intercollegiate men's team, the only existing team at the moment because there are not a sufficient number of women's teams. Let's say I deny the woman the right to participate on the team because of the ECAC proposition. Where do I stand legally?

Mr. Gangwere: The Supreme Court, in my opinion, would not find it illegal to prevent a woman from participating in men's events. I do not believe that would be a denial of equal rights. It has never been so held. I don't think the courts would so hold it.

Mr. Peck: Even if there were no other opportunities for her to participate at that particular time?

Mr. Gangwere: There could be the complaint that the institution has not given opportunity, and there would be a complaint there. She still would not have the right, in my opinion, to compete in men's events.

Mr. Peck: There have been no cases?

Mr. Gangwere: None that I know of.

George L. Shiebler (Eastern College Athletic Conference): Bob Peck made reference to the ECAC. It might be confusing when the word "prohibited" was used. The Eastern College Athletic Conference by-laws and rules of eligibility for competition state: "Every male undergraduate student of a member college or university shall be eligible to represent his institution in intercollegiate competition subject to the following rules." Then under subdivisions, "he must have completed, he must be a resident, he must have completed a minimum of so many semester hours, he must have satisfied the following," and so forth. So our rules were written and do exist only for male athletes in the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Miss Thorpe: Mr. Gangwere made the observation that the NCAA has been charged with the responsibility to regulate intercollegiate athletics. When the Constitution was written, although you did not write it in, you obviously did plan only to regulate for men. After our women's programs are initiated, I do not think it is honest to say that you feel you are also charged with regulating competition for women. If women in the United States had no competition provided and had no program and no possibility to have one, the NCAA would be wonderful to help us in that respect, but I do not think it is quite a logical statement to assume that the NCAA should do this because it has not been done.

Chairman Barnes: I want to thank those on the panel for giving their time and the benefit of their expertise. As with all panels and all round tables, it is understood that the problems are not solved, but you will leave here with a better understanding and more knowledge to return to your institutions. We appreciate your coming, and thank you for staying. We hope you have gained some information.

[The session recessed at 11:05 a.m.]

COLLEGE DIVISION ROUND TABLE

Friday Morning, January 7, 1972

The session convened at 9:30 a.m. in Les Ambassadeurs, Stanley J. Marshall, Director of Athletics, South Dakota State University, presiding.

Chairman Marshall: Welcome to the College Division Round Table. We have a very fine panel. I will first introduce them to you very simply and rather quickly.

Jim Bedell, director of athletics, Adelphi University.

Richard T. Bowers, director of athletics, University of South Florida.

George H. Gangwere, attorney for the Association, from Kansas City.

Howard C. Gentry, director of athletics, Tennessee State University.

Richard G. Koppenhaver, commissioner, North Central Conference.

Edgar A. Sherman, director of athletics, Muskingum College.

Edward S. Steitz, director of athletics, Springfield College.

We will begin with a presentation by Ed Steitz, director of athletics, Springfield College, on "Intercollegiate Athletic Competition for Women."

Edward S. Steitz: The legal point of view that I am going to present is that which has actually been researched by the law firm of Swanson, Midgley, Jones, Eager and Gangwere, and I am glad our attorney George Gangwere is here. I am going to use some of his direct quotes, with his permission.

The information relative to women's athletics has been so thoroughly researched that I am going to present what was gained as a result of communication with some of the women athletic leaders in the country, and I want to make sure that it is indicated to you this comes as the result of talking to these people, and as a result I formed by own opinion about it.

The question has been asked as to whether there are existing legal problems in the NCAA position which prohibits females from participating in NCAA championships and meets.

There appears to be nothing in the Constitution or Bylaws of the NCAA which specifically disqualifies a female athlete, but the logic of the rule is beyond dispute. The fact is that intercollegiate athletics have traditionally involved male athletes only, and the NCAA was organized to regulate intercollegiate athletics. There is nothing in the NCAA governing instruments which would prevent member schools from sponsoring intercollegiate sports contests among female athletes. Nor is there anything therein contained which would prevent the NCAA from adopting rules applicable to female athletics.

In the face of these facts the initial question is, however, do female athletes have any legal right to participate in intercollegiate athletic contests involving male participants? To deny this right is certainly discriminatory, but discrimination is not always illegal. As stated by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Goesaert v. Cleary*, 93 L.Ed. 165 (1948):

The Constitution in enjoining the equal protection of the

laws upon states precludes irrational discrimination as between persons or groups of persons in the incidence of the law. But the Constitution does not require situations "which are different in fact or opinion to be treated in law as though they were the same."

The discrimination here is based upon the biological fact that women in general lack the inherent physical attributes to compete equally with men in athletics. The discrimination in this case is against women as a class, because the class cannot qualify in fact.

On the other hand, many women enjoy athletics, and they have the same capacity as men for deriving benefit from participation in athletics. We know that women compete in the Olympic Games in substantial numbers and with distinction. It would seem, therefore, that female athletes could justifiably complain of the discrimination which fails to afford them opportunities for intercollegiate competition against other female athletes. The natural inclination would be to answer such a charge by stating it is not possible to provide such opportunities because there are insufficient female athletes willing to participate in athletics. Yet the Supreme Court held in a now outdated school segregation case (*Missouri ex rel. Gaines v. Canada*, 83 L.Ed. 208) that the fact of limited demand was immaterial; that the constitutional right to equal protection cannot be made to depend upon the number of persons who may be discriminated against, since the essence of the right is a personal point of view.

If it is true that women have a just complaint, then the course of history in discrimination cases indicates that a legal remedy will be found sooner or later. The proposed constitutional amendment for women's rights seems to be dormant at the moment, but it is not dead. If it were adopted there would perhaps no longer be any legally tenable grounds for disqualifying an athletically talented female from competing in an NCAA event. This would be open to construction by the courts. In any event there certainly would remain no legal basis for denying women equal opportunities to compete in athletics.

In order to make a case against the NCAA under the 14th Amendment, a female athlete would have to first establish that the rules of the NCAA involved "state action" or "color of state law." Courts in recent cases have had little difficulty with this requirement in the case of state athletic associations. Many of you have been involved. While it is difficult to see how the NCAA could be acting under the color of the laws of any state when its members come from all states and from private as well as public schools, the line separating private and state action has become blurred in recent years and recent decisions. Where the state has taken some action with regard to discrimination, the 14th Amendment has been applied against private individuals or a group of them. Also where private groups perform functions which are governmental in nature, the court has subjected them to the same constitutional limitations as is the state. In view of the many state universities in the NCAA, which give state sanction to the conduct of NCAA affairs and the rules thereby established, and in view of the public interest involved in NCAA rules, it does not appear that the requirement of state action would pose any insurmountable hurdle to an action against the NCAA under the 14th Amendment.

On the other hand the NCAA as such does not recruit athletes, nor organize teams, nor supply athletic facilities. It merely regulates intercollegiate athletics engaged in by male athletes. It would be argued that any illegal discrimination is that of the schools, not the NCAA. Yet the purposes of the Association relate to all collegiate sports and include the right to legislate upon any subject of general concern in the administration of intercollegiate athletics. It is doubtful, therefore, that the members of the NCAA are free to organize a separate association for female athletics. It follows, then, that if a charge of discrimination could be sustained it could be lodged against the NCAA as well as the individual schools.

In summary, from a legal point of view, the classification of separate male and female athletics is a reasonable one that should be sustained by the courts, and this classification is not that of the NCAA but one made by society in general that has been accepted by the NCAA. The NCAA was organized to regulate intercollegiate athletics, as I stated previously, and intercollegiate athletics have heretofore involved only male participants to any significant degree. The NCAA might reasonably adopt the position that should the need arise it is willing and able to regulate female intercollegiate athletics, but this would not constitute a good legal defense to a charge of discrimination.

For the past several years, women have participated in various athletics without benefit of any national organization. Functioning in a governing capacity is an executive for setting eligibility. Having sanctioned a few national championships (there have been no regional championships except those set up informally in many areas), the college women have gone into a commission, and this commission was composed of four members: A chairman who was also in charge of interpretations, a member in charge of regional development, one in charge of national championships, and one in charge of sanctions. At the district or regional level there was nothing.

Now this is all changed. The women's group has a national organization, the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, and has comparable districts; for instance, International Eastern Intercollegiate Athletics for Women.

The various regions have been working on committees for the past two years to set up the proposed structure and function of the national and the various district organizations. The charter members of the national organization expect to exercise their vote on the final disposal of these proposals at a meeting this spring.

When the national plans have been voted upon, those of the various regional organizations will follow in rapid succession. Until such time as this final national organization meeting is held, women athletes still function under the previously mentioned Commission on Athletics for Women. Following the national meeting this spring, this commission will be defunct.

The AIAW Handbook for '71-'72, called "The Handbook of Policies and Interim Procedure," spells out the structure, purposes, eligibility, championship programs, research, finances, insurance and development of local organizations.

Once the national and regional organization members have voted on the policies and procedure which have been proposed, they will have committees to handle the constitution and bylaws, ethics, griev-

ance, sanctioning, financing, eligibility, national and regional tournaments, et cetera. I am sure they will make some mistakes at the outset, but they have tried to anticipate problems that will arise and make provision for them rather than wait for them to happen and then set up the mechanism for dealing with them.

It has been mentioned that the men have anticipated becoming involved, perhaps including them in national championships. The men have a tremendous amount of experience, and there is no doubt in my mind there is much the women can and should learn from us. They should profit from our mistakes. The women have already studied very carefully our Constitution and Bylaws. They have studied judgments, the ECAC, et cetera, and have tried to put many of these things in their own proposed district and national organizations. But for the men to attempt to include women in championships, I feel this is the very worst possible time. The women are voting into existence their own district organizations. They have worked toward these. These tentative or interim groups are now forming their district or national championships. They must have this opportunity to see whether this plan is effective and efficient.

In my opinion if the men were to make overtures at this time to include them in our group, there would be one huge uproar on the part of the women. I see nothing to gain by it.

I believe that the women should run their own program. They have their own rules committees. They have been running their own tournaments a long time, and they have their own regional and national organization, as I have indicated. The only benefit I can see of their coming in is the possibility of television coverage, which up to this time has not been available. I am inclined to believe this would be prejudicial to women's tournaments. The women I have talked to aren't actually promoting it, at least until these tournaments become more known.

I believe women have the leadership. They have the potential for financing national and regional organizations. They have the interest and all the mechanism necessary to conduct regional and state competition in all sports. They look only on a backlog of finances, and this will come in time with the proposed financial underwriting in their literature.

From my point of view, the women should conduct their own programs completely independently. Our role as men leaders in athletics should be to assist them in enhancing a program of women's activities administered by women.

Chairman Marshall: The University Division is discussing the same topic and has arranged for a lady to be present with them. She is also here with us, and I would ask if she would care to come up. I am speaking of Joanne Thorpe, director of women's physical education at Southern Illinois University.

Joanne Thorpe: I prepared a presentation because I hate to be too lengthy. With your permission I would like to go ahead and give you the expression I prepared for the other division.

(Joanne Thorpe read the presentation which was repeated in the University Division Round Table.)

Chairman Marshall: Mr. Gangwere, do you have any comments you would like to make?

George Gangwere (Attorney at Law, Kansas City, Mo.): The opinions that I have given have only been an attempt to indicate that the NCAA does have somewhat of a legal problem in the fact that it has not provided opportunities for women to compete in intercollegiate activities despite the fact that the NCAA is charged with regulating all intercollegiate activities.

This is the problem basically of the schools themselves, but the schools, the member institutions, have been entrusted with the intercollegiate activities, so it is not a divine right that the NCAA do it. But under the constitution it seems to me it has an obligation and duty to regulate intercollegiate activities.

The answer which has been indicated is not to admit women into competition in men's events. It does seem, as Dr. Thorpe has indicated, there won't be too many women who can compete or qualify for that competition. So if you do that, you still have the situation where women who desire to compete in intercollegiate activities do not have an opportunity to do so. I think that is about all I can say at present.

Chairman Marshall: Thank you.

William Wall (MacMurray College): Are you entertaining questions from the floor?

Chairman Marshall: Are there other comments from the three reactors? Let's go then to questions from the floor.

William Wall: If you think you have problems, it is part of my duty as director of athletics to become director of women's sports. My staff has been directed to coach some of the women activities. I am also in the process of having a heart attack in putting in low-key need recruiting. As for men, we are on a need basis, so we are actively recruiting women's activities. When I coach the hockey team they will have a competitive team. This is a small college where the president tells you to do something. We have argued and debated against physical activities.

Joanne Thorpe: I knew you fellows at MacMurray were doing something. I might say in Illinois we have a state group which has been making the rules compatible, and MacMurray will have to travel out of Illinois and will not be able to enter the championships.

William Wall: Would you tell my president that?

Joanne Thorpe: I would be happy to write that.

Edward Steitz (Springfield College): I would hope that your president would be enlightened to support this academic discipline. We believe this strongly. We believe a sport without discipline has no right to exist. When your president puts in a new department of discipline, whether history or mathematics, he has the wherewithal and keeps it where it has to function.

At Springfield College we entered into competition for women and we based it on this particular thesis, and our president came to us and said, "Ed, will you take over?" And my comment to him was, "I think this is unsound. I don't think this is going to foster intercollegiate activities. The women should run their own show and have their own problems." And he recognized that particular fact and I think this was good, and we were fortunate enough to win the national championship twice. We are not getting into the mistakes the men made. Women's sport is an academic discipline just as men's sports.

William Lai (C. W. Post College): Would Mr. Gangwere clarify the statement where the universities and colleges have entrusted their athletic programs to the NCAA?

George Gangwere: Well, I believe that to be true. The constitution of the NCAA provides that one of the purposes is to regulate and control intercollegiate activities in general, and the Association is also given the power to enact legislation in that direction, and so I believe that upon a reading of the constitution it will have to be concluded that the member institutions entrust all of their intercollegiate activities to the Association. That is my only point.

William Lai: I am not here to debate that remark, but it certainly is not my impression that I have entrusted the entire athletic program to anybody outside the college itself. I would not agree with that interpretation.

George Gangwere: I think you are perfectly right that your entire athletic program has not been turned over to the NCAA, but you have turned over to the NCAA the power to legislate competition among the institutions, the intercollegiate competition. That is true, is it not?

William Lai: To a degree it is, but as far as the scheduling and as far as wanting to introduce a women's program and the possibility of a lawsuit against the NCAA are concerned, I can't see why that prevents certain action against the institution itself, if that is true.

George Gangwere: It doesn't prevent an action against the institution. If there were to be an action, it would probably be against the institution also.

My opinion was there was a potential danger to the institution because it is presumably participating in athletic activities and it has no programs for women to enable them to participate in intercollegiate activities. In fact, it excludes them from intercollegiate activities. That is a danger and has been indicated.

The Supreme Court has not held that discriminations on sex are necessarily unconstitutional, but it seems to me women students have grounds for complaint, and if they do have a just ground for complaint then sooner or later the courts are going to find a remedy.

Thomas Niland (LeMoyne College, Syracuse): Isn't it true the NCAA only regulates events that are national championships? Most of their rules are ineligibility of occasions used in national championships. Most of the directives they put out are repeated time and time again.

George Gangwere: I guess it is true they only sponsor certain championship events and tournaments and things of that sort, but the regulations extend far beyond that. You have rules as to qualifications for aid and for participation in intercollegiate activities.

Thomas Niland: What happens if you do not obey that rule? Generally, you are ineligible for national championship.

Mr. Gangwere: A student could be ineligible for intercollegiate activities; that is true enough. When it comes to sanctions against an institution, they would have to depend upon championship events, team events and things of that nature.

Chairman Marshall: I think probably the questioner's point is that essentially the enforcement comes when you attempt to go to an extra event, and if it comes to where you have 1.6, that is the point at which the penalty is assessed.

Harry Arlanson (Tufts University): In connection with the previous question, is there machinery for expulsion from the NCAA? That point should be brought out.

Chairman Marshall: Is that clear to everyone? Mr. Arlanson said, "Is there machinery for expulsion from NCAA?" And it isn't all dependent upon your participation in extra events. Is that correct?

Nick Rodis (Brandeis University): Our women have competed in intercollegiate activities for many years. As a matter of fact, we have a program right now in six different sports. I am chairman of athletics and we have a coordinator for women's activities and physical education. It is her duty to run the program and they are doing a great job. We have joined a new organization. How many schools have joined thus far? You sent out the literature, as I recall, about two months ago.

Joanne Thorpe: We sent the literature out in October, two months ago. The first membership came around October 20. We now have around 1,520.

Robert Devlin (Worcester State College): I would like to add a comment. Due to the practical administration on the level of an athletic director, it is not strictly a problem. But supposing a girl athlete in your school would like to try out for a team or play on a team of men. How about the reverse? If there is a sport the girls have in your school that you do not have in your intercollegiate league program—for instance, field hockey—and a boy wants to go on it. Will you comment if he has the right?

Chairman Marshall: Did the people hear the question? Can a man participate in a women's event?

Joanne Thorpe: I don't think you can hold one position without holding the other. You must agree then to let the men play on the women's teams. What I see occurring ultimately is fewer women participating because obviously, the men with higher skill would ultimately push out the women. This is why our association has adopted the statement that girls should be allowed to play on men's teams only as an interim measure unless women's teams can be provided. I think it would be reversed, that men could only be on women's teams until such time as a man's team could be provided. For instance, in our school men do not have volleyball. We have men who want to come and practice and occasionally I have them, but there should be an indication that they are attempting to organize a volleyball team so the people can participate in what they want to participate in.

Chairman Marshall: Thank you, Joanne. We will close this particular segment. We will now move to the Third Competitive Division and the presenter is Jim Bedell, director of athletics, Adelphi University.

James Bedell: To give you a little background on why this topic came up, at the request of some of the members the NCAA staff investigated the possibility of a third division, College Division II, similar to the football breakdown.

There are presently 411 college division members within the NCAA, self-determined by the institutions themselves. Many of this number, approximately 160, hold dual membership in NAIA and NCAA. At one time we held dual membership. I must admit we fit into the category that used the NAIA. That is primarily the college division championships.

The college institutions presently are carrying the following sports: There are 379 of the 411 college division schools who have baseball. I guess everyone has basketball. 328 have cross country. 318 have football. This is just to give you an example of the College Division teams. Most of them are carrying a pretty broad segment of sports programs.

There are currently within the NCAA 17 national championships in the University Division and only nine in the College Division. There will be the tenth addition, soccer. College soccer was passed at the convention, so there is a need. These numbers indicate a need for a finer breakdown in the competitive divisions.

The NCAA staff ran an analysis. What they did was to arbitrarily assign college teams to Division I or Division II just for the purpose of analysis. They found out that many of the colleges they placed in College Division I normally outlasted colleges in Division II on the 2 to 1 ratio. There was a certain segment that was always up there and there also was a broad segment who never really got there. They had fine programs but they weren't the same competitive level.

Also in analyzing the team sports, they found that the College Division I teams tended to appear more frequently in competition on a national level. What came out of this analysis was that there was a strong need for a breakdown of divisions.

The football games were originally set up for College Division teams. There are NCAA self-determined University Division teams playing in college bowl games because the Football Statistics and Classification Committee designates them as College Division teams. This has been a sore point with a lot of College Division people, too. Why should a group of two from the public, three newspapermen and three from the NCAA decide who is going to play in a College Division bowl? There is dissatisfaction with that. It is allowing outside people to decide. The colleges and universities don't have a thing to say—you only have three members and there are five people between the NCAA and the newspaper people who decide who is going to play in the game. There was a lot of discontent. There is a feeling with a breakdown in the division some of the responsibility may be alleviated.

The problem of a small school in New England that is in a College Division is considerably different from a college team in the Midwest. Evansville, if it is still in the College Division, is not the same as my institution. I don't feel we are competing with them. So there has been a further squawk.

There are problems with further breakdown. One is determination of what you get into. We know there are schools which, if we move them down a notch, would sweep out all the events—we also know there are other institutions who would like a fair shot at a notch in the competition.

I know right now it is the impossible dream for many College Division colleges to get considered. When you figure the odds are 411 to 1, the odds are not very good, and it is 245 to 1 in the University Division. I think possibly instead of three divisions there should be four. Maybe then some of the larger college teams would consider moving up a notch.

The other problem of placing teams in a division is how do you

put them there and how do they stay. The ECAC in restructuring came up with the following criteria which might be used. (I say "might." We are just throwing out ideas.) One is sports tradition. Naturally there are sports which have long-standing tradition—the emphasis on the program. There are those people who have a low-keyed program and other people have a strong national program. The emphasis of the program, the academic and philosophy, the financial aid program, and those with no financial aid except based on need, and then the male enrollment—these are the criteria we might use.

It would seem to me, first of all, some committee would have to arbitrarily break them down, with some recourse. With the computer you are in the A, B or C category and by initiative move yourself up or down, and you determine where you were going to be. As for change after that, we know how presidents come and go; I have gone through five in six years and they change philosophy in and out. Where one guy is happy with everything low-keyed, another wants to go big-time. The only thing to solve it is that it be at the Council level, and then you would have a way to appeal. It seems this would give us some stability and prevent the changeover.

A further question is the funding in competitive divisions. If you further analyze all the financial report, most of the time we bear the brunt of the expenses. Contrary to what people say, the deficit from certain tournaments is picked up by competing institutions. If we make money, the net profits are split for the NCAA and 50 per cent to the competing institutions. I don't think a further breakdown would be necessary. There would be the problem on the university level, and some colleges, with the TV program; the possibility of diluting some of the national competition because we have people looking at the national competition. The public gaze is on the university breakdown—the College Division breakdown in championships has received some press and some publicity. I think that we have to be concerned, if we break down further, that we are going to dilute the championship. I don't have an answer.

There are advantages in further breakdowns. It is quite possible, if you find your own competitive division, it will stimulate a broad program. As it is now there are a lot of College Division institutions who are really sponsoring one sport. It may be a basketball program or a football program and all the other sports are stepchildren. They are singed really; they get a little coal every now and then but no one really cares. They can't afford to compete. I don't see why the kids compete because they will never have an opportunity to make it nationally. It is possible in a further breakdown we may get to where we should be—having a broad program in athletics.

The other thing that might come in is to motivate reform in NCAA. With the present setup of 411 College Division institutions and 235 University Division teams, the Council has 12 university and six college representatives and the Executive Committee six university and one college member, so there is a slight imbalance in membership and the people who are really running it. This has caused some mistrust and unhappiness, and I think quite possibly we are getting into competitive divisions. Then I assume, with some regulatory revisions we might alleviate the sore spots.

I throw this out for discussion. I think we have to get to the reason-

ability. It is not just a College Division program. Chairman Marshall: Do we have any remarks from the athletic directors?

Ross Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I think the membership ought to know the College Committee did recognize the first problem you pointed out, of college tournaments being run by groups that are not basically College Division people.

The summer meeting recommended to the Executive Committee that in any sport where a College Division championship is held, a separate committee, whether rules or tournament, at least should be made up of College Division people, and a committee has been appointed—Dick Koenig, Harvey Chrouser and myself. I think this will be reckoned with.

I think it is very important we do make provision for adequate seats to be sure, if we want to go on with 10 champions in the College Division, at least the money will be regional. Football is a good example of a shaky start. In the early days of the Tangerine Bowl, I was particularly close to it. It was so small some refused to come because there wasn't sufficient expense money. I know this is a touchy item. Right now if you look at the regional program of the current program of college football, each school went home \$15,000 to \$20,000 better off. I know this isn't our prime objective but we have to be sure it is financed.

Chairman Marshall: One comment I would like to make. You know your College Committee is trying to get names of college personnel who will serve and work. This summer we went through all the possibilities and made recommendations of college people for those slots. We recognize some of that is set up so we can't change the discrepancies that Jim Bedell is talking about, but I suggest you volunteer, and our district people have attempted to make a survey.

Jim Feix (Western Kentucky University): I think there is little question that the restructuring of the NCAA is next. At yesterday's meeting on our need discussion, we were aware of the variety of problems that exist in different schools. I think we are aware that a rule is very difficult to apply to the variety of problems in different schools and philosophies we have.

I have a gospel that I have been trying to preach for a long time to a lot of people; that is, we most certainly need a classification of schools in our NCAA for competitive purposes, for control of eligibility, for a variety of regulatory services we receive. It is my opinion that this classification should be based almost in entirety on the scholarship and aid programs that are provided in the individual institutions and member schools. There are many points of view made in your presentation that would determine the classifications, but the emphasis that a school puts on a sport is reflected by the financial aid that school is willing to provide for that sport and to fill those scholarships.

We are in the Mideastern region. If we were to play football we would compete with a school that has 75 or 80 scholarships. If our school were to play in the bowl we might compete with a team that might have 25 scholarships. I think the entire philosophy is reflected in the number of scholarships.

I get very tired of people referring to the size of schools. We are a

small school. There are teams of a relatively small school of 1,800, and there are teams of schools of 30,000, playing College Division gymnastics because they have no scholarships. There is, in many instances, no relationship between the size of school and the caliber or quality of the athletic program. I think we most certainly need a reclassification in four divisions.

I would think the policy we operate under that requires a small school to be in one division entirely is incorrect. If a person wants to emphasize football he needs to be in a different division than in basketball. I am in a university where we want to emphasize one of those sports. Our other sports programs have a difficult time in the University Division. In our basketball situation we have difficulty because of the financial aid. If we want to enter into the unions, all we need to do is get 25 more scholarships.

I think the aid by scholarships has to be a basic part of reclassifying. If I can find people to play in baseball that don't have scholarships, and I have 40, I know I can win. Let's not get too far away.

Chairman Marshall: Jim, do you want to reply?

Jim Bedell: I would just go for one retort to that, the scholarship. If you tell me you would do it in a blank number of dollars, the gist of what you were saying I gathered was almost by individual sport. That is almost an impossibility to do from an administrative point of view. That is what you say—you should enter your baseball team in the College Division because you don't give as much to that.

If you asked me my opinion, fine; total dollar value or total number of scholarships. That gives the school the opportunity to emphasize whatever it is, if I put all my resources in and all the resources in one individual. As administrator it depends on what your philosophy is, or your president's philosophy is, on where he wants to go with the amount of money you have.

Chairman Marshall: Let's try to keep on the third division as much as possible.

Harry Arlanson (Tufts University): I don't believe in this third division category but I do want to support what Jim has said. In the Eastern Collegiate Athletic Conference we have gone through great growing pains to the point where we have now reached about 210 colleges and universities. You can imagine the various philosophies within a body of that group.

Again as Jim said, we have to restructure ourselves into three divisions primarily at this point for voting purposes. There is no question in the minds of many of us that will lead to competitive competition within the separate divisions.

Marshall Turner (Johns Hopkins University): Jim made reference to seed money a minute ago. I want to recall some things that happened in the early days of early competition in basketball. Everybody wanted to make the grade for College Division in order to set up national championships. I know in the very beginning we had a difficult time getting people to come, although they said they wanted it. The NCAA had to put up some seed money in order to get some people to come and play in the early tournaments.

The same thing has been true in some of the regional type of things, even though there was a lot of agitation nationally, and now third division competition nationally, getting people to come because they

can't afford it. As you go into soccer and baseball, team sports in which you get there by selection basis, you are going now to appeal for a third division and maybe a fourth division, so you have an opportunity to compete at the national level so everybody can come in. I don't think it will work. We talk about the next division and there are not enough people to go to the events. You are talking about another division so you can go to a national championship and yet everybody has trouble trying to make it. Unless the NCAA puts more into it, I don't think the national championship part can operate for your third or fourth divisions.

Mr. Bedell: I think the things we are trying to say, that we get hung up with in this meeting all the time, are details, the mechanics. Really, what we should have done is have everyone agree with the finer philosophy that there should be a further breakdown and it is up to the Council to use it. If we believe there should be a finer breakdown, then all the problems have to be resolved. It seems to me if there is a dictate from the membership then it behooves the administration of the NCAA to go about the mechanical means when we have reached that point. I agree these are problems.

Marshall Turner: What I am trying to say is, if the appeal for another division starts out with a national championship—perhaps what we are doing is talking national legislative business—a lot of that doesn't apply to a third division.

Mr. Bedell: I think that is part of it. I think we sometimes put the cart before the horse. I think it is going to lead right into the next subject because we are on it. That was a problem in the beginning.

William Bennett (Virginia State College): I am confused on the interpretation. Are you saying you will have three divisions now in terms of tournaments—schools will be selected and you will have three? For instance, in track you will have three tournaments or three championships in which a school may participate in Division I, Division II and Division III? We are getting a little confused.

Mr. Bedell: We are making a proposal: Does the membership think there should be a finer breakdown in competitive division. What does it mean? My college, Adelphi, will either be in the University Division, which it is not, or College Division I or Division II, and that is where we will compete. Eventually I would assume it would lead to legislative action—the thing would follow. If you are asking about right now, everyone jump into something, no, but that is the way it would lead.

Chairman Marshall: Dick Bowers, director of athletics, University of South Florida.

Richard Bowers: I would have preferred meeting with the University Division as a total group, like we did yesterday on this particular issue as well as the women's issue. I think it behooves all of us to share these ideas.

This NCAA legislative reorganization was brought about primarily due to the financial-aid-based-on-need proposal and based on the tenor of the discussions yesterday regarding this particular financial aid proposal. There may or may not be a need for reorganization.

I do like Jim's comment about restructuring. It may be more palatable and acceptable in those particular terms.

Let's look at the background. I am sure all of you would like to

know how these things come about and who proposes them, whether this is a particular idea on the part of Walter Byers or Earl Ramer or the Council or Executive Committee. Bear with me a moment in terms of a little history of this thing, and later we will lead right into the questionnaire that was distributed. It gives a great deal of information collected from our total NCAA membership.

In August 1971 the NCAA Long-Range Planning Committee submitted its regular report to the Association's Council. One of the Long-Range Planning Committee's proposals concerned a review of the organizational structure and future role of the NCAA. The Council authorized the officers to appoint a special committee to undertake the study outlined by the Long-Range Planning Committee, and directed the special committee to give its immediate attention to the possibility of legislative reorganization of the NCAA toward a possible division of the Association's membership for legislative purposes.

Appointed to the Special Committee were Mr. David Swank, University of Oklahoma, Chairman; Mr. Edward Czckaj, Pennsylvania State University; Mr. Claude Gilstrap, University of Texas, Arlington; Mr. Edgar Sherman, Muskingum College; Mr. Robert James, Atlantic Coast Conference; recently appointed to the committee was Mr. Stanley Marshall, South Dakota State University, and myself. The Committee met October 14, 1971, in Kansas City to begin its study of the charge by the Association.

Some of the questions posed at the meeting were:

Can reorganization be accomplished without a redistricting plan?

What would be the Council and Executive Committee representation?

Would separate divisions (possibly three or four) lead to a split within the NCAA?

Is the present system of University and College Division voting on all issues a good check and balance system?

Do large and small institutions injure one another in the present voting?

Would separate divisions bring together institutions with common athletic objectives and interests?

If the divisions have separate bylaws, would this be too confusing to the NCAA staff and the total membership?

The Committee sent out a questionnaire to all member institutions to determine their general thoughts on the matter. The Committee is considering a tentative proposal to divide the NCAA into several divisions composed of institutions with similar athletic philosophies. When an institution chooses a particular division, all of its national championship competition must be within that division. Presently the Committee is working with a structure of three divisions, although a four-division structure has been considered.

Under the proposed reorganization, the NCAA would retain a Constitution that would be applicable to all divisions and would express the basic philosophy of the NCAA. This Constitution would be enacted upon its passage by a majority vote of each of the divisions. Amendments would also have to be adopted by a majority vote of each division.

In addition to the Constitution, each division would have its own

Bylaws enacted by a majority vote of the members of that particular division. Such items as recruiting limitations, the specifics of financial aid and extra events legislation would be included in the bylaws, just to mention a few.

In a recent NCAA staff analysis of the membership along three-division lines (and this was the staff looking at the particular institutions as they perceive their philosophy and desire and objectives perhaps along national competition lines), they divided them in the following manner: 238 institutions were listed as University Division, 124 as College Division I and 238 as College Division II. College Division II would be the largest in terms of institutions, but smallest in terms of undergraduate and male enrollment.

As to a redistricting plan, the NCAA staff recommended four districts which did not disrupt conference boundaries, yet grouped institutions with similar interests.

Let me quickly go over two of the four district plans. In Plan I they combined Districts 1 and 2. This includes 226 institutions. District 3 would have 139. Districts 4 and 5 would have 165, and Districts 6, 7 and 8 would be combined for 105. In Plan II, Districts 1 and 2 were combined for 226 institutions. Districts 3 and 6 combined for 168, Districts 4 and 5 for 165 and Districts 7 and 8 for a total of 86.

I do have an individual breakdown in terms of University and College I and College II specifics, but I gave you the total with the rationale being that the Council and Executive Committee representation would be affected by these particular districts.

One factor that could not be overcome in attempting to balance numbers would be the 141 College Division II institutions in Districts 1 and 2.

Even though there are many options, the NCAA staff offered a suggestion as to the Council and Executive Committee membership. As you know, the Council is made up of 18 members, and the staff was proposing that the new Council have the President; the Secretary-Treasurer; four District Vice-Presidents; three Divisional Representatives, assuming there are three divisions (there might be four), and with four divisions there would be at least five At-Large—three from the University Division and one each from College Division I and from College Division II.

The Executive Committee would include the NCAA Officers, three Divisional Representatives and possibly three to five At-Large members. These are options.

The Council responsibilities would be basically unchanged except that certain items of discussion would be passed on to divisional committees. The Executive Committee would probably continue to operate as usual in transacting the business affairs of the Association in accordance with the policies of the Association and the Council.

As to the Division responsibilities, each one would determine regular-season eligibility rules, financial aid, number of grants, etc. One problem area could be particularly sticky—the eligibility rules for NCAA events, especially in those events where the NCAA has only one championship.

Others have mentioned the particular pattern ECAC has. I think many of the Committee thoughts have paralleled that particular trend taken by the ECAC.

The latter part of October, the NCAA Committee on Legislative Reorganization, which is the Committee I referred to, sent out a memorandum and questionnaire to all faculty members and athletic directors of the Association.

Let's look at Question No. 1. I think this is a real good question as well as the information through all of these others. It gives you a good idea what the Association is.

1. Is a reorganization of the NCAA necessary at this time? You see the response—612 yes, 126 no, 20 other. The percentage was 80.7 as opposed to 16.6. I won't give you the percentage on the "other."

2. Would you favor a plan such as the one outlined in the memorandum? 602 responded yes, 114 no, 38 other. That is 79.8 as opposed to 15.1.

3. Should the NCAA Constitution apply to all institutions? 643 yes, 81 no, 32 other. That is 85.0 as opposed to 10.7.

4. Should there be separate Bylaws for each NCAA Division? Again, the implication is financial aid and/or Bylaw regulations in each division? 570 responded yes, 177 no, other 30. The percentage is 72.6 as opposed to 23.4.

5. If the NCAA were divided, should there be three divisions based in part on the present University, College Division I and College Division II structure? (That is, if there should be three divisions.) 570 said yes, 126 no, 61 other. The percentage was 75.3 to 16.6.

6. If the NCAA were divided into three divisions, in which division would you place your institution? 269 in University, 172 in College I, 250 in College II and 66 other.

7. If the NCAA were divided into four divisions, in which division would you place your institution? The breakdown is probably more equitable. 172 in University I, 134 in University II, 126 in College I, 252 in College II and 70 other.

8. Would you favor a reorganization of the present NCAA districts? Yes 305, no 351, other 96. The percentages are 40.5 yes and 46.7 no. I cannot explain why that did not follow the others. You might not be able to have one without the other and therefore, I am wondering if there was some thought that maybe this would be a breakup in terms of conference boundaries. This is the only thing I can figure that might be the reason for the vote. Others might be pointed out in the discussion later.

9. Would you favor a reorganization of the NCAA Council? In the yes category were 438, 219 no and other 97. The percentage is 58.1 to 29.0.

Again, I think many of these are philosophical questions. The real idea is to get the divisions in groups that have similar athletic philosophies, similar objectives and, therefore, I think there is a great deal of connection here with the third division discussions.

The financial aid discussions also tie in here, with the total implication being if they could determine their own Bylaws then University I people could do what they want and College I people could do what they want and College Division II people who didn't have quite the same aims could do what they want, and if they didn't want to give any aid at all. I know the argument: If we were recruiting the same boy, how could we do it if we were College II? I don't know the answer, but you would have difficulty recruiting the same boy if

your particular division was based on aid based on financial need or no need at all. That is a decision you have to make to decide whether you want to run with the big boys.

Let's throw it open for discussion at this time. Ed Sherman is probably more qualified to speak on this in terms of his experiences, and so I will refer several to him.

Edgar Sherman: I think Dick did a very good job in reviewing the one meeting the Committee had, but I want to make plain their recommendation that came out of that committee.

We discussed what should be included in the questionnaire, but the Committee did not see the questionnaire before it was sent out. The answers might have been different had it been a plan you had been voting on. We did not present a plan that I know of to the Council. We discussed some possibilities. We did not know there was thought being given to a special convention. The development of the special convention has come since the Committee met.

The questionnaire was passed out here. The first time we saw it was at the convention, so I want you to know that. I assumed nothing would be done or no vote would be taken until some kind of a plan was developed further by this Committee and taken to the Council for approval. So I am very interested personally in the reaction of that group in order that we might take back your thoughts to the Committee.

Richard Bowers: Also let me make it clear that we tried to think in terms of what the group wanted and also meet the charge given to the Committee. After the discussion I think it might be in order to take a little informal poll to see what the group would like. I think this Committee, if it is to meet again, would very much like to have your particular thoughts, because we represent you. Again, realize this isn't something that is final by any means.

Wilford Ketz (Union College): I would like to present to you a viewpoint which I feel very deeply. We have received a presentation here today as to what the Committee discussed in their four-hour meeting, and that is the first indication I have had as Vice-President At-Large concerned with College Division, and as far as I know that the College Committee has had, as to what was in the minds of the Swank Committee. One of our representatives, Stanley Marshall, chairman of the College Committee, was appointed to that Committee within the last three weeks and was formally notified he was on the Committee when he arrived here.

When the questionnaire was sent out, it immediately created in my mind the possibility of confusion. We are talking about the problems which the previous speaker had spoken about—three-division competitiveness rather than pure legislative organization—and when you talk about the ECAC you must remember they talked at the top with their Executive Council and restructured that, and then went down into their three divisions.

So really, when you are talking about legislative reorganization, which appeared as a possibility of a special convention only after this series of meetings, you are talking then about restructuring, the possibility of your districts, the shifting of powers, and the question in my mind is how can you possibly come out with a well-thought-out plan between now—when there is no plan, according to Ed Sherman,

and he is on the Committee—and about April, when this material must go to the membership for consideration. In that interim I see no possibility of its being considered by the College Committee, for example. So what is this going to do to our whole program? Are you going to be giving up more than you already have?

I agree with one of the previous men—we may be under a benevolent autocracy under the Committee, etc. The fact is, until there is a plan on the table that can be carefully considered by the College group as to where they are going, I believe that we ought to hold off on that.

Now what really brought about this drive: I think it is generally agreed that the universities are very worried that the College Division is going to foist onto their backs the need formula into the package. After meeting with the College Committee, I went to the Council and reported there was a possibility that this could be taken separately; in other words, the original idea of a convention for the need formula, which has been in the mill for over two years and well thought out. You may or may not agree with it; nevertheless, it is a well-thought-out plan now, and the question is whether you could hold up the legislative reorganization by having a special amendment for one specific purpose; to have divided voting on the final package, if that was going to be taken care of at the special convention.

Harry Cross, the parliamentarian, wrote such an amendment. Then there was quite a feeling that reorganization should be No. 1. I don't want to argue the point; I just want to present my point—that I believe it would be the long-range interest of the College Division to hold up the legislative reorganization until such time as there is a well-thought-out plan that meets the approval of the College Division group, and then let's go in that direction. But to come up with a plan of this Committee without any of the checks and balances and thought that should be given to it by a special convention, it is entirely possible that you are going to get some legislative reorganization program and then the financing package goes down the drain, too.

Richard Bowers: I can agree with a great deal of what Mr. Ketz has to say. I believe there should be a great deal of thought given to this. I would imagine if a vote was taken yesterday, financial aid would be gone. There still may be a need for the Committee to study throughout the year. There may not be a need for a special convention on reorganization, but with Stan Marshall being on the Committee now and with many other thoughts that have been picked up, have this Committee meet during the year. That may be the best move in thinking through what we call the restructure as opposed to reorganization.

Ed, do you have any particular thoughts along these lines, maybe in answer to Bill's comments?

Edgar Sherman: That is almost what I was trying to say to begin with. I thought perhaps we ought to go slow on the thing, and I was kind of surprised when I got here, after having attended one meeting, and saw the questionnaire and saw there was a possibility for a special meeting to consider.

I think it goes back to a committee that was formed to put out a fire when all the hullabaloo started, by some of the big football coaches, about breaking away from the NCAA. We don't want that

either, but I am sure we don't want to have anything jammed down our throats, and we want to be sure, if there is a reorganization, that the College people have equal representation.

Since I have been connected with this organization, I think the College Division has come an awful long way, and I certainly don't want to see anything done in two or three months to undo the work that has been put into it by some of these older heads that are sitting around here. Maybe we need it. I don't think there is anything wrong with studying it, but I like to do it in a sensible way, and I don't think we ought to be pressured into anything just because there is some discussion by a group of football coaches.

Richard Koenig (Valparaiso University): I think it is important that everyone understands the proposal for the special convention. Proposal No. 1 will be for a special convention which will consider financial aid and legislative reapportionment. If that is passed, there will be no need for any other proposals. If that is rejected, there will be another proposal which comes in front of you, which says we should have a special convention, and they will come in this order. We should have a special convention which will consider legislative re-division or restructuring or whatever the term is. If that is passed or if it is rejected, either way, there will be a third proposal in front of you which calls for a special convention to consider financial aid.

Keep in mind if the first proposal is rejected and the next two proposals are passed, you are right back to where you were when you rejected the first proposal. Is that clear? Theoretically, you have rejected the first proposal. You don't want to consider financial aid and legislative restructure, then by adopting the next two you have said you want special conventions to consider those two things. I point that out at this time so you can give some thought to how these proposals are going to be voted on by each of you at the time they come in. Are there any questions on this point?

Ross Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): Of the financial aid and reorganization, which would be first?

Mr. Koenig: Your regulatory proposal will come in first, and some have advanced the position, should that be voted in, the special convention could be implemented immediately to consider the financial aid package.

Mr. Smith: Do the two Committee members on the panel agree it is impossible to put together a plan that could have enough meaning to us to say we support it, or would it be too vague? Could we eliminate ourselves from some of the financial support we feel is rather critical? There are 40 or 50 colleges involved in making all the TV money, and unless we can write in some statement of faith that would be strong, that would indicate that the type of funding we have had which has been very basic to the operation of the College Committee would continue, I, for one, wouldn't be willing to vote for any kind of restructure.

Mr. Sherman: I don't know what the procedure would be of presenting the plan. I was going to ask the question myself. If the Committee met several times—I am sure it would take several meetings—and came up with a plan, then we go to the Council for approval before the special convention. That is one of the things that would bother me a little bit. I certainly wouldn't want to be a member of

a committee that took a plan to a special convention without some safeguards from other members of the organization who would be more knowledgeable than the Committee. I would think that you would want to be sure that safeguards are built into any plan you have, before you accept where the finances are coming from.

I have faith in what the University people have done in the past. I think they have been good to us and shared their television money with us and so forth. If our College Division programs are going to continue like they have, and even if we are going into the third division, we have to be sure that is in it.

Richard Koppenhaver: I have no definite proof, but I am pretty sure the University people have done a pretty good job of disseminating their point of view among their own members. One thing that bothers me is they are living on budgets, and if this convention follows other conventions, tomorrow afternoon a lot of people are going to take advantage of early flight departures, and you are going in and it will be about three o'clock. This thing is going to be debated a lot more heavily. I wonder if we can't take some action to have these issues presented early on tomorrow's program rather than the two barrel on the program.

James Bedell: I don't know how many were at the delegates' orientation. It was reported that football revenue is four and one-half per cent. Half of that goes for promotion. The bulk of it goes to the university, and the NCAA comes out better on basketball. This concept that football is carrying the weight and assisting the College Division is erroneous. I understand they are going to increase that to six per cent with one and a half per cent going into the general operating expenses. NCAA takes care of the building being done, unless I am mistaken, but I heard that said twice. The speaker said that four and a half per cent they take from football goes into football and possible graduate scholarships. I didn't hear him say that a lot of that money goes into the general operating of the college. Basketball has been more than generous, but certainly not football.

Louis Spry (Assistant to the Executive Director of NCAA): Jim has stated it correctly. We understand it. In our basketball revenue this year, three-quarters of a million is estimated. The basketball has not gone into football revenue. The golden goose laying the egg has been the collegiate basketball championship.

Richard Koenig: Will Ketz served on the Executive Committee and he can tell us. I think everyone has stated the position accurately, except in the promotion of football there is a significant sum that is allotted to the College Division football championships.

Wilford Ketz: Fundamentally that is true. Don't get it confused. The pressures we are talking about are on the financial need practice. This is where the football people fear you are going to put a need formula on their back. Some of you heard the representation of the coaches there last year, but as far as the sport is concerned, that comes from general operating expenses. The golden goose is that basketball program, no question. We are in six figures at the present time with no support. They are the boys who are supplying a lot of this money. Are they going to have the same broad viewpoint that we have had with the Council and Executive Committee?

One question: I see that the Vice-President At-Large is written

out as a possibility when you restructure. You didn't mention him anyway.

Richard Bowers: You are talking about the Council and Executive Committee. This again was taken from NCAA staff reports.

Mr. Ketz: This again is one of my contentions, having been a Vice-President At-Large. This is the only way that College people can get on the Executive Committee. I am sure of that, and again they have been a very fine group.

Louis Spry (NCAA): Am I not correct in this: You said if you went to four districts you would have a representative of College Division I and College Division II from each district on the Council, plus there would be a representative from each College Division district on the Executive Committee?

Mr. Bowers: I did not have a chance to talk to them because it was mailed. On the Council would be the President, the Secretary-Treasurer, four District Vice-Presidents if we go to the four-district plan, and three divisional representatives. Now here is maybe what you are referring to and I am not sure I made myself clear: Four At-Large. These are just options and we know that. Three from the University Division, one each from College I and College II—excuse me, that is five At-Large, and one each from the two Divisions. Again, this was an error on their part. I copied it down in terms of numbers there.

You say the University Division would have greater representation. I imagine their argument—again my university is College Division—is they have the larger male enrollment or whatever.

I do appreciate Dick's clarification on the situation with the resolution and the voting, and I think it does behoove all of us to stay as long as possible on some of these important issues that have come up the last day in the past. I have known things to change from the day we left and went back home. We found what we voted on one time wasn't what ended up at the end of the day.

Robert Pritchard: I just want to point out that this is a very ill-advised structured questionnaire. I think Dave Swank will admit to that. The percentages are not quite as obvious as they appear—80 per cent for reorganization. I would question the advisability of asking the commissioners to vote on this because it would be a dual vote if they voted. Swank was asked if the College institutions were represented and they were the same individual. He was asked whether the people sent in one or two questionnaires. You don't know unless you ask the secretary who did the collating.

The question is: Is the reorganization of the NCAA necessary at this time? And the great percentage said yes. If I were to ask you if you want to go downtown, I think most of you would say I want to go downtown. Then if I said before we go downtown we have to do this or we have to go there or it is raining or there is a detour, then I think a lot of you would say no.

Here is a question out of the blue without any plan, and the Committee admits they know nothing about a plan. They talked about it superficially.

I just want to emphasize that it seems apparent there is a great move for reorganization. I am not sure that is true.

Marshall Turner (Johns Hopkins University): I would like to sup-

port Will Ketz and some others. I think legislative restructure is very important. It ought to be looked at very favorably by the Council and Executive Committee, and time is not there to do this job. We could stand to gain or stand to lose. I hate to think we have to take that issue under the gun of a press vote and find that we shot some of the college programs on those to be separated.

It seems to me, if the financial aid package proposals are going to be voted on and the Council wants to force that vote, that we can at this point take the contentious position so we are not involved in the potential loss of funds if we vote in favor of the need idea in financial aid. We can always change that later on. We are strong in that we outnumber three to two or three to one. We can take that independent of the reorganization bid.

Now the business of the special convention, of course, comes in here. I am opposed to the convention for financial reasons. I have been more willing to consider a financial aid day at the next convention with nothing but that on the agenda, with the aim of getting a vote on that.

I think we ought to find a way to separate them so we don't have to take the reorganization under the threat of a financial aid or potential loss of funds, if that is going to be a weapon they would like to use.

Chairman Marshall: I would like to make one comment since Bill referred to it. There was no switch, from my point of view. We did in our meeting vote unanimously to support the idea of supporting reorganization ahead of financial aid. I feel that is appropriate.

I am not panicked by the large institutions. I have never felt they would leave us. They have more to lose than we have. If they did leave we could conduct a very effective program. Even the little NAIA functions very well.

The College Division has made progress each year in getting more to say about Association activities because of men like Bob Pritchard, Bill Ketz and Marshall Turner, etc. You must remember that Division was formed primarily by University people, and we did not come to conventions for years. Many of us have membership in NAIA, and we have come in numbers very late because of the leadership I described.

Personally, I don't think whichever one is discussed first is the key issue anyway. I assure you if we go into reorganization with this Swank Committee as referred to, we will do a thorough and good job not only continuing the College influence at the present time, but I think we can advance it. We have no feeling of attempting to sell out to anyone. How you vote on those things, of course, is your privilege.

Edward Malan (Pomona College): I don't like the options available to me. The only option I have is either vote for a joint separate convention or two separate convention sessions coming sometime at the end of this year. I wonder if that really is what we want or whether we agree with the sentiments of Bill Ketz and Marshall Turner and others, that we have more time and have a plan before us long enough before we have any kind of convention or discussion at all.

Since one o'clock this afternoon is the time any resolutions or amendments may be presented, I wonder if there is enough consensus in this group to ask that your Committee present an amendment that would give us an additional option in voting tomorrow.

Chairman Marshall: We would certainly consider that. I would indicate you have a very fine option to vote against the three amendments, and you then are back where we are now and you are not rushed into something.

Mr. Malan: I beg your pardon, that is an option but it is a negative option. I would like a more constructive option.

Chairman Marshall: I personally wouldn't say it is a negative option, and if I felt I didn't have enough information, I would vote down all of them. However, we can certainly consider it.

Ross Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): If we do vote all three and if indeed there is a movement to phase the financial aid program before we reorganize—and we have that—I think we have to strongly face the several votes that could lead to a pullout regardless of what you think. It is going to be bad to see this fragmentation develop within the organization.

Chairman Marshall: In Ross' opinion, if we vote on financial aid first it would be a pullout.

C. D. Henry (Grambling): We talk about the big schools and small schools, the College Division favoring a financial need package.

Chairman Marshall: The College Committee voted on favoring reorganization ahead of financial aid.

Mr. Henry: Is there any scholarship or grant-in-aid program based on need working that could serve as a model? Is there a conference for financial aid based on need?

Chairman Marshall: The Ivy League, of course. The ECAC. Ed said the Midwest Conference is concerned. The Ohio Conference.

Walter Hass (University of Illinois, Chicago): The question I have from personal discussions is whether any aid program should cover all institutions or whether it should be a divisional decision that is made. I think that is what everyone here is hung up on, instead of the order of things.

Chairman Marshall: The College Committee considered what you are saying. If we were able to attack this by Divisions or groups, we might do a little more intelligent job on the Committee. Am I not reflecting your thought?

Mr. Hass: I get a feeling that everyone is concerned about a package and not a divisional thing, which appears to be the thing we are going into—the divisional setup. I want to know is it the divisional setup which seems to be the consensus?

Chairman Marshall: That is the question we are considering, whether to consider aid first or reorganization. If we discuss reorganization first and in fact do reorganize in such a manner in the bylaws, we do control aid. Presumably we set our aid by Divisions. If we vote on the aid package first, unless there is something by the Cross amendment, it is the other way.

Jim Bedell: I think we are hung up. I see a simple solution. Maybe it is. We structure in each Division whether we pass the financial aid package tomorrow, and it applies to tomorrow, and then there is a committee to restructure, and within the bylaws of each Division they have the right to decide certain things and financial aid is one of them.

There is no reason why that particular Division couldn't rescind that legislation that started out on the broad concept. I, personally, don't see this being a problem—whether we vote financial aid in tomorrow

and at a later date, with all the evidence, we decide to restructure.

I realize what Bill Ketz said about the reason they want to reorganize now: So we don't get into the financial aid package in that area, and if we passed the financial aid there might not be need for restructure.

Mr. Ketz: I was just pointing out the Cross amendment. You have a special convention only on financial aid, permit divided voting constitutionally for just one question, with each side, College Division on one side, University on the other, as presently constituted, being bound by their own decision.

Francis Smiley (Colorado School of Mines): I want to follow up on the suggestion made here concerning the position of the resolution in the agenda. I am quite concerned that this proposition get a full hearing, and it won't get it at the end of the session. I would suggest that perhaps the College Committee could ask that this follow No. 12, which is the last constitutional item, and if it could be proposed to the convention that this be placed following No. 12 instead of the end, we could have a chance to thoroughly air it. Incidentally, I am in with Bill.

Chairman Marshall: I would be so guided and as I am chairman of the College Committee I would attempt to. How many are in favor of trying to get that? How about opposition to it? Then I shall attempt to do that.

I am afraid we are running overtime. Dick wants to have a straw vote and it is the last thing.

Richard Bowers: I am not sure how we should word the particular motion. Bill, would you like to word it in the sense we might get a sense of the group?

Wilford Ketz: I would appreciate it if you would put it in this measure: First, do you feel that reorganization should be considered as a major matter? Secondly, should this reorganization be considered as a special convention or delayed to a later time to allow further discussion?

Mr. Bowers: Two separate votes.

Mr. Ketz: I think you want to know first whether we are interested in it at all.

Mr. Bowers: How many feel there is a need for reorganization? I know we had the questionnaire. After the discussion we may have different views. So all in favor of reorganization, reorganization or restructuring, please stand. No question, it is a majority.

If I understand the second one, Bill, is there need for prior consideration? In other words, prior consideration to the convention. I am not sure, there are various other variables connected with that. I am not sure it is clear.

Mr. Ketz: I think what I would like to do is see a straw vote of this group as to whether legislative restructuring should be the first matter considered at a special convention.

Mr. Bowers: Any questions?

Ross Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): The first matter at the special convention would precede the financial aid.

Ed Bennett (Washington State University): Could we assume financial aid?

Edward Athey (Washington College): Why don't you vote to have

it at next year's convention?

Mr. Ketz: I would accept that.

Mr. Bowers: All right, all in favor of this being taken up at the convention next year? Please raise your hand. (Carried.)

William Wall (MacMurray College): In other words, we do not want to handle this now?

Chairman Marshall: We would get considerable support for two years and three years and four years. We have a lot of presidents back home who are looking to us.

Delegate: Not as heavily on legislative restructure as they are to make a decision on the financial aid. Let me add one comment here that is disturbing to me. On paper the Council has endorsed and supported the Executive Committee in their position of financial aid. Having it expressed to the delegates here assembled is a different matter. What disturbs me is the hesitancy or lack of aggressiveness, if you will, by any member of the Council who has so indicated his support. I have not yet seen, with perhaps the exception of Mr. Cross, that financial aid based on need is a necessity of the Council. I wonder why.

Chairman Marshall: Thank you. We are forced to adjourn the meeting. Please go to the District meetings and continue the discussion.

(The session adjourned at 11:50 a.m.)

HONORS LUNCHEON

Friday, January 7, 1972

The Seventh Annual Honors Luncheon was held in the Convention Hall, President Earl M. Ramer presiding. President Ramer introduced the Reverend L. Lloyd Behnken, who gave the invocation.

Rev. L. Lloyd Behnken: We pray, Lord, our God, gracious, loving, to know you is to love you and to love you is to serve you. We praise your greatness, for from you we have received every good and perfect gift. Our body and mind and spirit are just at your grace and the great gift we have, the good land we have inherited, the opportunities we have to train mind and body and spirit, in schools and colleges, in work and recreation and daily living with people, the gift you give us daily that we may learn your kind of life so the fulfillment of your purposes can be ours, not just there and then, but here and now. All this comes from your loving hand, O Lord. Accept our thanks. Be with us here today. Bless this organization and those who specifically train young people for life through their participation in athletics, and bless with special joy and humble gratitude those we especially honor this day for personal achievements under your guidance. We thank you for them and for their great contribution to our lives. Give our fellowship and our food the grace of your presence that we may have your joy and your peace this day and always, in the name of Jesus. Amen.

President Ramer: Ladies and gentlemen, our master of ceremonies today is a notable reporter of sports events of many types. Most of us may know him best for his knowledgeable coverage of college football, but he is equally at home in commenting on golf, basketball and many other sports. His assignment on Wide World of Sports leads him to comment on most kinds of contests known around the world. His work has earned him such prestige as to receive the Headline Award, the Sylvania Award and the Peabody. A graduate of Washington State University, he rates at the pinnacle of his profession.

It is with great pleasure that I present to you our master of ceremonies, Keith Jackson. [Applause]

[Mr. Jackson assumed the chair as toastmaster.]

Toastmaster Jackson: Thank you very much, President Ramer. It is a great pleasure to be here. Those of us who run about the world always have a few moments, a few places and a few people that we like to spend our time with, and there is no one I would rather spend my time with than the men and women who have made, who are making and who will make intercollegiate sports as worthwhile as it has come to be, as it has been and as it will be.

I think today, as we move rather rapidly through our program, it will be a singular pleasure to all of you to meet some of these people, and I hope those of you who do not know them will take the time to get acquainted. I feel indebted to all of them for the work they have done so well. I would like to introduce the representatives of the affiliated members of the NCAA, each man doing a particular and

specific job in an important area of intercollegiate athletics.

From the American Association of Baseball Coaches, Lee Eilbracht from the University of Illinois, the executive director. [Applause]

From Stanford University, the president of the Baseball Federation, Dutch Fehring. [Applause]

The president of the American Football Coaches Association, Earle Edwards, North Carolina State University. [Applause] And Bill Murray, executive director. [Applause]

The president of the College Athletic Business Managers Association, Robert Cahill of the University of Notre Dame. [Applause] And John O'Neill, the president-elect. [Applause]

The president of the College Sports Information Directors of America is from the University of Massachusetts, Dick Page. [Applause]

The president of the Collegiate Commissioners Association of America, Lloyd Jordan, of the Southern Conference. [Applause]

Representing the Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association, the president, from Michigan State, Stan Drobac. [Applause]

The president of the National Fencing Coaches Association is Michael DeCicco, Notre Dame. [Applause]

The president of the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame, Senator George Murphy. [Applause]

Representing the United States Track Coaches Association, Stan Huntsman from the University of Tennessee. [Applause]

We have some gentlemen here on the dais I would like to have you meet.

The secretary-treasurer of the NCAA, professor of physical education at District of Columbia Teachers College, Samuel E. Barnes. [Applause]

The executive director of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, Walter Byers. [Applause]

We are honored today by the presence of a gentleman who is to receive the Theodore Roosevelt Award, Dr. Jerome Holland. It is with great pleasure that I present the Honorable Jerome H. Holland, United States Ambassador to Sweden. [Applause]

Congressman George H. Mahon was to receive a special award, but he was forced to remain in Washington because of illness. In his absence we would like to salute his efforts in behalf of the National Summer Youth Sports Program. We have a telegram from the Congressman. He congratulates the National Collegiate Athletic Association particularly for the efforts taken to produce this fine program. He is aware of the setbacks but hopes that all of you realize he will give it his continued support, and he voices his sincere regret at being unable to be here, but he does thank all of you.

A significant part of the NCAA honors program is the recognition of its annual postgraduate scholarship winners. It is regretted that all 80 of the winners for 1971 could not be here to participate in today's program, but today the NCAA would like to salute these scholar-athletes. There are four representatives here today. It is fitting that they should be introduced by a man who was president of the NCAA when the postgraduate program was started in 1964. He is dean of the Division of Extension and University Service at the University of Iowa, a man who has made many contributions to the NCAA in many ways, Robert F. Ray. [Applause]

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. Jackson, President Ramer, ladies and gentlemen: Once again we are assembled in this fine traditional gathering to pay tribute to a distinguished group of Americans. They are at once the guardians of one of our most precious rights, the right to be well-informed in an ever more complex society, and at the same time they have achieved many honors of the profession of journalism.

On the record we know another honor was once bestowed upon each of them, a varsity letter for their participation in intercollegiate athletics. In their professional lives we find they reflect the highest values of intercollegiate athletics—fair play, teamwork and, of equal importance, tenacity in the pursuit of excellence.

It is fitting that the National Collegiate Athletic Association give them the recognition they will receive today. It is also fitting that we honor today the promising group of young men who are the recipients of the NCAA postgraduate scholarships. Each scholar-athlete represents in a real sense our ongoing faith that the values of participation in intercollegiate athletics will be reflected in their lives. No one can project what contribution they will make to society, but we do know with certainty that opportunities for leadership will surely be theirs.

The Postgraduate Scholarship Program of the National Collegiate Athletic Association stands today on the threshold of a milestone, the half-million-dollar mark. When 33 awards were presented to football seniors last fall, the total awards made in seven years of the program's operation climbed to 497. Therefore, when fifteen additional awards of \$1000 each are made to basketball seniors this spring, more than \$500,000 will have been directly invested in the advanced education of student-athletes of our member institutions.

This considerable amount of money is an investment in our nation's future. It is our testimony as educators of our substantial respect for, and confidence in, the scholar-athlete who has the self-discipline and other qualities necessary to earn the varsity letter while demonstrating academic excellence.

It is wonderful indeed that the Association has been able to increase the awards from the initial 32 per year to the current total of 80. We find there is no lack of qualified candidates. Today's young man measures up to the highest of standards. Competition for these awards is always exceedingly heavy.

I am confident you will agree that their qualities are conspicuous when you meet our three guests who represent them today. Two are now attending graduate college. One has won a scholarship last fall.

First, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to present to you, from the University of Florida, Carlos Alvarez, wide receiver, with a 3.25 grade point average in political science. His home town is Miami, Florida. Carlos is a three-year starter who has been recognized as one of the best receivers in college football throughout that period. He holds a number of Florida and Southeastern Conference receiving records, including the conference record for career receptions. He has earned both All-America and All-America Academic honors. He was president of the Lettermen Club and a member of the Student Government. He is a member of the national political science honor society, Pi Sigma Alpha. He has been on the dean's list regularly. He intends to do graduate study in law. [Applause]

Now I would like to present two young men who have utilized postgraduate scholarships and currently are pursuing their graduate work.

First of all, a basketball guard at Florida Southern College who graduated in 1969 with 3.4 grade point average in social studies, Richard Fred Lewis. Fred is now a student at the University of Miami School of Law. His home town is Beckley, West Virginia. As an undergraduate he was his team's captain, playmaker and outstanding player. He won all-conference honors. He was president of his sophomore, junior and senior classes. He was a member of three honor societies and of the President's Council on Academic Standards. [Applause]

Our third honoree is James G. Pressly Jr. An outstanding tennis player at the University of Florida, James Pressly was graduated in 1969 with a 3.4 grade point average in English. He, too, now is a law student, at the University of Florida. His home town is Palm Beach, Florida.

He never lost a singles or a doubles match in the Southeastern Conference. He was a member of the Junior Davis Cup team and the champion of many invitational meets. Three times he was named to the SEC all-conference team. He was selected as the outstanding athlete in his graduating class. He was elected to Phi Beta Kappa and was often on the dean's list. He is a member of the honorary leadership fraternity.

Gentlemen, to you and a distinguished group of student-athletes you have the honor to represent, we extend our heartiest congratulations and best wishes for your continued success. [Applause] Now Mr. Pressly will respond for the graduate scholars.

James G. Pressly: There are at least three groups of athletes who benefit from the NCAA graduate scholarship program. I would like to thank and congratulate NCAA as a representative of these three groups.

The first and most obvious of these are the scholarship recipients themselves, many of whom are attending professional schools with little if any financial assistance granted.

Another group that has benefitted by that program is that composed of all college athletes. One of the most frequently voiced complaints about college athletics today is that the athletes are not a real part of the academic student body. The recognition afforded the winners of these scholarships calls attention to the fact that athletes are indeed a part of the academic community, and moreover, that they may excel in spite of the demands of participation in sports.

The third and final group for which I speak is made up of athletes attending the large state universities and participating in so-called big-time athletics. Ed Marinaro is quoted as saying, "We have to study, too." He was obviously implying that some students and athletes devote their time to sports at the exclusion of study. The large number of postgraduate awards made to those attending the state universities in the Midwest, the South and the Far West seems to suggest that the students who have academic excellence as well as athletic ability are not restricted to any single part of the nation or any type of school.

Once again, we thank you. [Applause]

Toastmaster Jackson: I talked yesterday with a young man who is

one of the world's fastest sprinters, who undoubtedly is going to appear with the United States Olympic Team next winter; a man who graduated last spring. He is in graduate study of business administration. It was with something of a wistful expression that he felt he had suddenly been thrown out of his home—suddenly he did not have the university, he did not have the class, he did not have the security of the university. Once you reach graduate school, you start to slice it on your own. In trying to maintain an academic schedule required of the graduate division, as well as trying to maintain the physical standards in order to make the Olympic Team, he suddenly found he has had to reach back for something extra. Fortunately, like these young men, he has that something extra. He got it from intercollegiate competition. Perhaps most fortunately, he realizes it.

We have here on the dais gentlemen who have been instrumental in keeping us informed. Today we are going to honor 19 of this nation's prominent journalists in the print and the electronic media. With their colleagues they bring us the facts, the opinions, the anecdotes and the ideas from all over the world. I am sure they have an influence on our daily lives.

The news and the men who report the news, and their vital role in our daily life, can never be emphasized too much—the fairness, wisdom, sincerity and all the other factors that they contribute to the impression of us as Americans and of other people to us. The NCAA is honored by the presence of these distinguished gentlemen, and we would like to salute them for their achievements and their contribution.

The first gentleman I would like to introduce is Hanson W. Baldwin of the New York Times. Mr. Baldwin retired in 1968 after a distinguished career as military editor of the Times. He was a two-year letterman for the U. S. Naval Academy in 1923-24, and he won his collegiate letters in water polo. Having seen water polo in competition, I guarantee you he earned those letters. His institutional representative here today is Captain J. O. Coppedge, director of athletics at the United States Naval Academy. Mr. Baldwin graduated from the Academy in 1924 and served in the Navy for 3½ years. He joined the Baltimore Sun staff as a cub reporter in 1927.

He left the next year to spend a year traveling through South America. I didn't know the Baltimore Sun paid that well. [Laughter] Baldwin joined the New York Times in 1929 as a general assignment reporter. He became the Times' expert on military affairs and in 1942 was appointed military editor. Baldwin won many writing awards. He was awarded a Pulitzer Prize in 1942 for his reporting from the South Pacific, and he received the coveted Syracuse University School of Journalism Award. He has received three honorary degrees. Mr. Baldwin is past president of the Naval Academy Alumni Association, and now resides in Roxbury, Connecticut. [Applause and presentation of the plaque]

One of my contemporaries, one of our business's more colorful personalities, is another little, skinny country boy, really, who grew up big and strong, Thomas Brookshier, CBS. Tom graduated from the University of Colorado in 1953. He was outstanding in football and baseball. His institution's representative here is Eddie Crowder, director of athletics and football coach of the Colorado Buffaloes. You

haven't heard a lot about the Buffalos this year, but wait until next year. [Laughter]

Tom Brookshier has done a lot of things in his young life. He is a football analyst for CBS. He has a background in radio. He wrote a newspaper column for four years. He played football and baseball at the University of Colorado and then played both professionally. He is now sports director of WCAU-TV in Philadelphia, host of "Sports Illustrated of the Air," co-host of a weekly football preview show, a featured announcer on CBS-TV's coverage of professional football and a regular broadcaster of college bowl games.

He started at Colorado as an outstanding defensive back and played baseball four years. Following his graduation he played pro baseball for a year. He was a star with the Philadelphia Eagles from 1953 to 1961. [Applause and presentation of plaque]

The next gentleman I would like to have you meet is Arthur Collins Jr. of the Boston Globe. He graduated from Baldwin-Wallace College in 1951 with a letter in tennis. His institutional representative is Lee Tressell, director of athletics at Baldwin-Wallace College.

This is another honoree who vigorously pursues versatility. He is now editorial columnist of the Boston Globe. He was an outstanding tennis player. Those of you who have watched tennis on television recognize his name, as he is an outstanding commentator. He is as well versed on the game of tennis as any man in this country.

As a senior he served as acting tennis coach at Baldwin-Wallace. After serving for four years as sports information director while an undergraduate at Baldwin-Wallace, he moved to Western Reserve University for four years as SID. He next wrote boxing and tennis for the Boston Herald, and managed to coach the Brandeis University tennis team and win the national indoor mixed doubles title.

In the mid-60's he changed from the Herald to the Globe. He is a former editor of the USLTA Yearbook, a contributing writer to many tennis publications and has co-authored a book with Rod Laver. He is winner of the world-famous tennis team Marlboro Award. Arthur Collins. [Applause and presentation of plaque]

From the North American Newspaper Alliance, Mr. Ernest L. Cuneo. He graduated from Columbia University in 1927, football. His institutional representative is the NCAA second district vice-president, Ernest C. Casale, director of athletics at Temple University.

I could stand up here for 30 or 40 minutes and talk about Ernie Cuneo. He graduated from Columbia University Law School, in addition to having received his B.A. there. He is a practicing attorney in Washington, D. C., besides writing the daily, nationally syndicated column. He was a starting guard for Columbia in 1926 and 1927. Those were the days when Columbia was 11-5-2. Those were good days.

During college vacations he worked, and he worked and he worked. He was appointed liaison officer during the war years among the OSS, British Intelligence, the FBI, the Department of State and the White House. With Britain's Sir William Stephenson and General William Donovan, Cuneo settled the basis of operations with the European underground movements. He is quite a man. Following the war he resumed his practice of law, mostly the law of journalism. He wrote "Science and History," which received wide acclaim in intellectual

circles, and also wrote "Life With Fiorello" which Carl Sandburg called an American classic. We are delighted to honor Ernest Cuneo. [Applause and presentation of plaque]

The next gentleman is one of the nice men in our business. He is a pro of the first order, Mr. Jack Drees, of the American Broadcasting Company. University of Iowa, 1938. I don't think I have to tell you that he played basketball. He played three years and starred at center all three years. He was active in the business he chose as a career during his undergraduate days at the University of Iowa in 1936, 1937 and 1938.

He was a member of the 1938 tennis team. He won All-Big Ten honors in basketball his senior year. He was a staff member of the campus magazine and the University paper.

He moved to Chicago after graduation, to WJJD. There he did the Chicago Cubs and White Sox baseball games and handled Big Ten football and basketball on station WIND. He also did the Cardinals' pro football games, and the Chicago Bears. Jack's done it all. He has gone all over the world, and everywhere he has gone he has done it right. That's the kind of guy he is. He went to ABC in 1946 where he started horseracing broadcasts. Jack is with the Chicago White Sox, where you have seen him in recent days. He now lives at La Grange, Illinois. His institutional representative is Chalmers Elliott, Iowa's director of athletics. We are delighted to have Jack with us today. [Applause and presentation of plaque]

I consider the next gentleman a very close friend, and I consider him one of the best in the world in his business. He doesn't stand too tall except when he becomes competitive, and then he becomes a big, big man. Chet Forte, producer and director, ABC. Chet graduated from Columbia University in 1957, All-American in basketball. He was a two-time All-American who hit a career high of 45 points and averaged 24.5 points per game for three varsity years. He averaged just under 30 points for each game as a senior, he holds 14 Columbia records to this day and he twice was All-Ivy League.

It is in football perhaps that he has earned his greatest professional reputation, however, for he has been involved in the production of NCAA, NFL and AFL football, and he is now producer and director of ABC's Monday night pro series. In other words, he is one of the men who prevents the whole afternoon from being a series of skippy nothings. He provides the skippy.

Prior to joining ABC in 1963, he produced NFL football at CBS for two years. At ABC he first worked on AFL telecasts, then NCAA, and now the NFL. He won an Emmy Award in 1969 for his production covering the 1968 Summer Olympic Games. His institutional representative today is NCAA Council member Frank Carver of the University of Pittsburgh. [Applause and presentation of plaque]

Also from the American Broadcasting Company—Old Swivel Head. He was perhaps the most dreaded, feared member of the University of Southern California backfield during his playing days. He has now become one of the outstanding television personalities and sports broadcasters—Frank Gifford. Frank's institutional representative today is the faculty representative from the University of Southern California, Mr. Jack Larsen.

Frank was All-American in college football and All-Pro in profes-

sional football with the New York Giants. He is now play-by-play commentator on ABC's "Monday Night Football." He will be seen in this year's "Wide World of Sports." He is also a regular sports reporter on WABC's nightly "Eyewitness News," a program in New York. He has also written several magazine articles and is the author of two successful football books.

He could play all the positions when he was playing football. If they got in trouble they would call on Frank. If they needed a place-kicker they called on him. If they needed a forward pass, they called on him. He was All-American in 1951. He was No. 1 draft choice of the New York Giants in 1952. He was All-Pro six times, and NFL's MVP in 1956. He had a great time in 1962. He came back with the Giants and was the comeback player of the year. He retired in 1965. He was established at that time as one of the game's greats and he remains that today. Frank Gifford! [Applause and presentation of plaque]

One of the best in the business is Marty Glickman, WNEW Radio, New York; Syracuse University 1939, football and track. Versatility has marked this man. I guess Marty has done it all, at one time or another—basketball, football, baseball, boxing, track and field, bowling, harness racing, wrestling, rodeo, hockey, skiing, even marbles. [Laughter] They say "even marbles." Marty, I don't believe that. [Laughter] That is an actual fact. They do have a marble championship, and Marty has won it.

He was a three-year letterman as a halfback at Syracuse and was a member of the U.S. Olympic team as a sprinter in the 1936 Games in Berlin. He graduated from Syracuse in 1939. He broadcast college and pro basketball from Madison Square Garden on WMGM and New York Giants football on WNEW and WMGM. His baseball experience includes 18 years of broadcasting pre- and post-game shows for the Dodgers and Yankees. You know his voice from films, documentaries, television. He now lives in New Rochelle, New York. We are happy to honor Marty Glickman. His host institutional representative is James H. Decker, Syracuse University athletic director. [Applause and presentation of plaque]

Next is another country boy. A lot of us, once we go through the turmoil of paying our way or making our way, whatever you want to call it, retain the identity with what it's all about and have a chance to go back and enjoy what God gave us. The next man probably enjoys an afternoon on the river bank or a day in the mountains as much as any man alive. He is a native son of Wyoming, graduated All-American in basketball in Wyoming in 1942, now with NBC—Curt Gowdy. [Applause]

For fifteen years Curt broadcast the Boston Red Sox games. Then he moved over to NBC. I guess Curt has done every sports event you can think about at one time or another during his career. He started in 1944 in Cheyenne, Wyoming. Then he went to Oklahoma City where he covered the University of Oklahoma football and basketball and Texas League baseball. In 1949 he won a job with the New York Yankees and joined Mel Allen. He became the Red Sox play-by-play announcer in 1951. From there he has gone straight up.

He was an outstanding basketball player at Wyoming. He was a three-year letterman and a member of the 1941 Rocky Mountain Con-

ference championship team and the 1942 team which won 15 games in a row. Wyoming honored Gowdy with its Distinguished Alumni Award in 1962. He now lives in Forest Hills, Massachusetts. His institutional representative is the director of athletics of Wyoming, Mr. Glenn Jacoby. Curt, congratulations! [Applause and presentation of plaque]

We have another lion with us. He has had an outstanding career in his chosen profession. It is most outstanding. Mr. Lou Kusserow of the National Broadcasting Company. He was a graduate of Columbia University in 1949 in football. With him, his institutional representative, Kenneth G. Germann, director of athletics at Columbia.

Lou Kusserow has produced more blue-chip sporting events than anyone else in television right now. Yet the one-time All-American back at Columbia University hasn't seen a game live in ten years. He watches the games from NBC-TV's mobile control unit in which he works. Kusserow's assignments have included Rose Bowl games, Super Bowl games, World Series and NCAA Championship basketball games.

He was an All-American at Columbia in 1948 and then played with the New York Yankees of the old All-America Conference. After two years in the Army, he played in the Canadian Football League. It was during his Canadian stay that he became involved in broadcasting. He joined NBC in 1956 and has pioneered network sports production since that time. He was an outstanding athlete in high school in Pennsylvania, and at Columbia he established nine school scoring and rushing records while winning All-East honors three times and All-America in 1948. Mr. Lou Kusserow. [Applause and presentation of plaque]

We are going now to the printed media, and one of the most respected names in journalism, from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Harold Lebovitz. Harold Lebovitz was a member of the Western Reserve University basketball team, which won the Big Four championship in 1937. He coached the freshman team the following year and then spent eight years coaching and teaching at Euclid High School in Ohio.

In 1948 he started his newspaper career with the Cleveland News. He covered major league baseball with the News until the paper folded in 1960. Lebovitz immediately joined the Cleveland Plain Dealer sports staff and four years later was appointed sports editor. He is now also doing some television sportscasting as part of the Cleveland Cavaliers. He has won more than twenty writing awards. He has had twelve articles printed in "Best Sports Stories of the Year," "Pitchin' Man With Satchel Paige" and "Football for Females" and is the co-author of "Springboard to Science." He as a past president of the Baseball Writers of America and the Ohio Sports Editors Association.

He now resides at University Heights, Ohio. With him is the athletic director of Case Western Reserve University, Philip Heim. We are proud to honor Harold Lebovitz. [Presentation of plaque and applause]

When you say Marquette you send a quiver through the basketball ranks of the NCAA today. We have a gentleman with us from the Associated Press, Mr. Gerald J. Liska, Marquette, 1935. He won letters

in football and basketball. With him is the director of athletics from Marquette, Samuel Saucedo.

Gerald Liska played football and basketball and graduated from the Marquette School of Journalism in 1935. He returned 25 years later to receive Marquette's "By-Line Award," the annual award for a graduate who has won distinction in the field of journalism. And he certainly has. He has covered World Series, championship fights, Indianapolis 500—you name it, he's done it. Olympic Games in Rome and Mexico City, the 1959 Pan American Games in Chicago and Pan-Am Games at Sao Paulo, Brazil; Winnipeg, Canada, and Cali.

He started his newspaper career with the United Press following his graduation from Marquette. He then worked as sports-telegraph editor of the Fremont (Ohio) News-Messenger. Liska joined the AP in Lansing, Michigan, in 1941 and was assigned to the AP's Chicago sports staff in 1944, rising to the editorship in eight years. He is a resident of Mount Prospect, Illinois. Gentlemen, Gerald Liska. [Presentation of plaque and applause]

The next gentleman won his football letter at the University of Notre Dame—football and basketball, Class of 1922. He perhaps became most famous in the southeastern part of the country. From the Atlanta Journal, Harry J. Mehre. He was an All-America center on the 1920 and 1921 Notre Dame teams, which lost only one game. The loss was a 10-7 decision to the University of Iowa, the national champion. He never played football until he went to Notre Dame. He was a basketball standout in high school. He was a three-year letterman in basketball for the Irish. He was captain of the basketball team in 1921.

He played football for the old Minneapolis Marines of the National Football League. He coached football and basketball at St. Thomas College. He became line coach at the University of Georgia in 1924 and served as head coach at Georgia from 1928 to 1937. In 1937 he was named director of athletics and head football coach at Ole Miss, where he stayed until 1946. Then he went commercial. He became president of Sunny Isles Company, Inc., a soft drink firm, in 1946. However, since 1947 Mehre has been a featured football writer for the Atlanta Journal. He writes a column three times a week during the football season for the Journal. He attends every game, every week, that he can get to for the Atlanta paper. He writes a syndicated column for seven newspapers. He is a resident of Atlanta, Georgia. With him is the Notre Dame athletic director, Ed Krause. [Presentation of plaque and applause]

Iowa is very well represented here. From the Des Moines Register and Tribune, a graduate of Drake University, football, track and basketball, 1944—Clark R. Mollenhoff. Clark is one of the most honored writers in the United States. Included among his many honors is the 1958 Pulitzer Prize for national reporting. He is chief of the Washington Bureau for the Des Moines Register and Tribune. He has served as Special Counsel and Deputy Counsel to the President of the United States. In addition he writes a syndicated column, "Watch on Washington," and is the author of five books.

He graduated from Drake in 1944 with a bachelor's degree in law. He lettered in track, football and basketball and was captain of the football team in 1943. Drake honored him with an honorary doctor's

degree in 1961. He has received three other honorary degrees. He started his journalism career as a city reporter on the Des Moines Register from 1941 to 1944. He served two years in the Naval Reserve. He has been an investigator and political writer. He studied government administration and the history of American government and politics at Harvard in 1949-50. He became a Washington correspondent for Cowles Publications in 1950. In 1960, he received the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship and traveled throughout the world. With him is the faculty representative of Drake University, Mr. Leland Johnson, Clark R. Mollenhoff! [Presentation of plaque and applause]

Another gentleman that I have had the pleasure of knowing well and working with for several years is a 1944 graduate of Princeton University, basketball, soccer and lacrosse, Mr. John Palmer of ABC. He was All-America in basketball. He played for the New York Knicks for four years. He has been involved in radio and television work as an independent announcer for all three networks. He has covered the Olympic Games and major golf tournaments, ABC's "Wide World of Sports" and was co-host on the Football Scoreboard Show following the NCAA football games on ABC-TV this season. Bud also has his own program called "Sports International," a series of 90-minute sports programs from around the world.

He was born in Hollywood, California, though he doesn't look it. [Laughter] He was a United States Navy pilot in World War II. In 1966 he was named commissioner of public events by New York City Mayor John Lindsay. He now lives in New York City. His institutional representative is with him today, Princeton director of athletics R. Kenneth Fairman. We are glad to welcome one of the nice guys in the business, Bud Palmer. [Presentation of plaque and applause]

From the Milwaukee Journal, a graduate of Western Kentucky University, 1954, in football—William W. Sanders. Bill Sanders is recognized as one of the nation's top editorial cartoonists. His work has been published all over the world—in the New York Times, London Observer, Time, Newsweek, throughout Latin America and Europe, even in Izvestia.

He joined the Milwaukee Journal in 1967, and his editorial cartoon appears daily on the Journal's front page. It isn't always so nice, but he does get his point across. He also has a contract with Publishers Hall Syndicate, and his work is distributed to 18 newspapers across the country, including the Denver Post, Los Angeles Times, Honolulu Advertiser, Washington Star, Houston Post, Kansas City Star, and so on.

Bill was born in Springfield, Tennessee. He majored in English and while at Western Kentucky was a two-year letterman in football and established an NCAA College Division record in 1953 with a .667 pass completion percentage. He turned down a pro football offer to enter the Army. After submitting cartoons to Stars and Stripes, he joined its staff in Tokyo as a civilian cartoonist in 1957. He then moved to the Greensboro Daily News in North Carolina in 1959, and four years later joined the Kansas City Star staff. He left the Star in 1967 to join the Journal. He is a former president of the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists. With him is Western Kentucky's head football coach, Jimmy Feix. William W. Sanders! [Presentation of plaque]

The next gentleman is a graduate of Tulane University, 1936, in track. He was captain of the 1936 track team and still holds the Green Wave record in the high hurdles. From the American Broadcasting Company, Mr. Howard K. Smith. Howard was student body president in his senior year at Tulane. He attended Heidelberg and Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar after graduating from Tulane.

Before joining ABC-TV in 1961, he worked for twenty years with CBS as European correspondent and manager of CBS's Washington office. He started his news career with the United Press. He has written two books, "Last Train From Berlin" and "The State of Europe." Among the many honors he has won are the DuPont Commentator Award, a television Emmy for writing "The Population Explosion," the Overseas Press Club award for best reporting from abroad, the Paul White Memorial Award and the University of Missouri Honor Award for distinguished service in journalism. Tulane honored Howard K. Smith with an honorary degree in 1955 and he has received six other honorary degrees. He now lives in Washington, D. C., and with him is the director of athletics at Tulane, Rix Yard. [Presentation of plaque and applause]

From the New York Times, Damon M. Stetson, Bates College, 1936, hockey, cross country and track. His institutional representative with him today is the athletic director at Bates, Lloyd H. Lux. Damon Stetson was a three-sport letterman at Bates. Not only is he today an avid sports fan, but he actively participates in tennis and skating.

After graduating from Bates in 1936, he joined the staff of the Newark Evening News. He served as a reporter, bureau chief and copy editor during his stay from 1936 to 1953. He joined the U. S. Navy. In 1953 he moved to the New York Times. He was with the Detroit bureau from 1955 to 1963. He moved from Detroit back to New York in 1963 as the Times' labor correspondent. His reporting of labor has won him national acclaim and various honors. He has written a book, "Starting Over," which tells a middle-aged person how to start a second career. I think I will get a copy. He now lives in Verona, New Jersey. We are proud to welcome, from Bates College, Damon M. Stetson. ([Presentation of plaque and applause]

From Drake University, Class of 1942, letters in football and basketball, with the Des Moines Register and Tribune, Maurice N. White. With him is his institutional representative, Mr. Robert D. Karnes, athletic director of Drake University.

Maury White's education took a little while after he got out of high school, like a lot of ours, but during the delay he got a head start on his writing. Maury's father, who was owner and editor of the Manila Times, a weekly newspaper, died six weeks after Maury graduated from high school. Maury and his mother decided to keep the newspaper going, with Mrs. White handling the business end and Maury doing the reporting and writing, including a weekly column. Later Mrs. White hired an editor and Maury went off to Drake University. He combined his athletic and newspaper talents there. He was the leading rusher for Drake in football as well as a hard-hitting outfielder in baseball.

He was a member of the Drake campus newspaper staff and a part-time worker for the Des Moines Register and Tribune. After graduating from Drake in 1942, he joined the Navy, and he was here

and there, where the action was. He came back to the Register and Tribune staff and quickly attained national recognition. Five of his stories have been reprinted in the annual edition of "Best Sports Stories," and he has won three awards for the best sports story in the Iowa Associated Press competition. In 1962 he won the U.S. Basketball Writers Association's first-place award and was voted Iowa's outstanding sports writer. He is a past president of the Football Writers Association and a past director of the Basketball Writers Association. He lives in Des Moines—Maurice N. White. [Presentation of plaque and applause]

Those are the gentlemen the National Collegiate Athletic Association wishes all of you to meet and to honor this year. You can never really measure the contribution these people have given. You can see they took their college letter and their college experience and they put it to good use. I think perhaps the gentlemen who will respond in behalf of the group will make that point. Let them make their own point in their own way.

Representing journalism, Mr. William W. Sanders.

William W. Sanders (Milwaukee Journal): President Ramer, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen and free loaders of the press [Laughter]: I am very hesitant to stand up here and speak for people who write. People who write are very uncomfortable when they name a cartoonist to speak for them. [Laughter] I decided I had better consult a few of my colleagues, most of whom are not talking to me at this moment. Hanson Baldwin suggested that I might offer the suggestion that a little mass bombing of the brass at Oklahoma, Colorado and Alabama would do well to settle the argument you currently have in the NCAA over division.

It was also suggested to me that I divulge a bit of spot news previously unknown to this moment, so I announce to you that, unlike many of his colleagues in the United States Senate, the Honorable Senator George Murphy is not running for President of the United States. [Laughter] The second bit of news also concerns Senator Murphy, whose current discontent is well-known with the conservative views of the administration on intercollegiate basketball and football. He supports John Lindsay for President. [Laughter]

Several members of my institution suggested I get up here and make a very lengthy speech about what I learned at Western Kentucky. I thought about that little bit, but the only thing I could remember that really sticks in my mind was if you can learn to pass from a dead stop backward you don't get hurt. [Laughter]

When the NCAA in Kansas City called me to make this response, they said, "Keep it under two minutes and keep it simple and try to express the feeling you have about playing at an institution that belongs to the NCAA." Keeping it simple is a little difficult. The position I feel I have been put in reminds me of a story.

On a plane going to Washington there was a very learned scientist-astronomer, and next to him was a very learned theologian of a very high caliber, from a school of theology.

During the course of the conversation the astronomer finally said, "What is it that you do?"

The theologian responded that he was a theologian.

The astronomer then introduced himself and said what he did.

Finally the scientist turned to the theologian and said, "Say, after all, can't you really sum your whole business up by doing unto others as you would have them do unto you?"

The theologian thought about it and said, "Yes, I suppose I could sum it up like that, about like you could sum yours up by 'twinkle, twinkle, little star.'" [Laughter]

Anyway, in behalf of the press media and the very distinguished and outstanding colleagues of mine, we thank you very much. It has been our pleasure. [Applause]

Toastmaster Jackson: Thank you. And in response in behalf of the electronics side of journalism, Howard K. Smith.

Howard K. Smith (American Broadcasting Company): Mr. Ramer, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Barnes, distinguished colleagues, ladies and gentlemen: Coming down here on the plane I mused to myself whether it was age or beauty that caused me to be chosen to speak for my fellow visible reporters. Then last night on television in this hotel I saw a commercial for a hair preparation in which the face was the face of Don, but the voice was the voice of Howard. [Laughter] I recall that my stable has given you one pretty face, and therefore I am sure that you do not choose me just on the basis of seniority.

Whatever your reason, your choice is unique in one respect. I think I am the only male American to come from Washington, D. C., to Florida and address an audience, who is not running for President of the United States. [Laughter]

Until today I have had to nourish my dreams of athletic glory on a few old memories, like a flower pressed in an old book, growing more dusty every year. Now I can add two more lines, so to speak, with a little fresh blood on the stately flower of memory because of the honor you have given me by selecting me to speak today, and I think the still greater honor of being able to speak for so many better commentators than I who have also been far better athletes than I. For them and for me, I express our deep gratitude and our hopes that you will continue to preside over the process of producing the world's greatest athletes and keep us the nation of champions. [Applause]

Toastmaster Jackson: Now I would like to bring back to the podium the NCAA president, Earl Ramer of the University of Tennessee, who will present the Theodore Roosevelt Award to a most distinguished gentleman.

President Ramer: Ladies and gentlemen, the 1972 winner of the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the United States Ambassador to Sweden, Jerome H. Holland, is a truly distinguished American well-known to all of us. Trying to choose from among Ambassador Holland's many honors, activities and attributes is really an impossible task. Rather than attempting to enumerate them, therefore, I shall attempt to relate his achievements briefly to those of past recipients of this highest award of this Association.

Like our first recipient, Dwight Eisenhower, Brud Holland is a leader and an articulate advocate of freedom and international understanding. Widely traveled in his search for ways to create better relations among people, Ambassador Holland has received in his work such awards as the First Freedom Foundation of Temple University Distinguished Service Award for Experiment in International Relations. When appointed ambassador he began learning the Swedish

language and spent much of his time traveling through the country and meeting the people. His person-to-person diplomacy has been widely acclaimed both in Sweden and in the United States.

Ambassador Holland is a distinguished statesman in the mold of Senator Leverett Saltonstall. Both gentlemen have some care and keen interest in national affairs. He has been active in organizations promoting the causes of education, welfare, human relations and human rights, as indicated by his membership in the American Red Cross, United Negro College Fund, the Boy Scouts of America and the National Conference of Christians and Jews. He served on the executive board of the American Management Association and the board of trustees of the Virginia Museum of Fine Art and is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Brud Holland's athletic achievements closely parallel those of Justice Byron R. White, having acquired his letter as All-America end in football at Cornell and having been elected in 1969 to the National Football Foundation Hall of Fame.

Equally pleasing to him, I am sure, was the dedication last October of Holland Stadium in his home town of Auburn, New York, which cited his achievements as an example to be emulated by the youth of his community.

He was a member of the NCAA Council and served the Association in other important ways.

Like Frederick L. Hovde of Purdue, Brud Holland was a university president. He was president of Delaware State College from 1953 to 1960 and of Hampton Institute from 1960 until March of 1970. His record as administrator earned him places on the Cornell board of trustees and the MIT board of corporation.

Finally, Brud Holland is a scientist, as is Christopher C. Kraft Jr. His scholarly disciplines are social sciences rather than in the space sciences, but he, too, has taken giant steps forward for mankind. The quality of his work is exemplified by the Human Relations Award from Virginia State College and by the awarding of eight honorary doctorates.

In addition, Brud has been an instructor in sociology and assistant football coach, personnel director for a shipbuilding firm during World War II and author of many publications, including a recent book, "Black Opportunity."

He is a member of the Advisory Committee for an All-Volunteer Army, of the Policy Committee for the Advertising Council and of the Commission on Selective Service.

He is also a member of Sports Illustrated Silver Anniversary Football Team and is the 1968 recipient of the Salvation Army Award.

Jerome H. Holland was graduated from Cornell in 1939, received his masters there in 1941, and his Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania in 1950.

He and his wife Laura have two grown children and two teenagers.

He was appointed Ambassador to Sweden by President Nixon in January 1970.

I have two messages that have come to Brud today from two governmental representatives in Washington who could not be present but who wanted him to know of their congratulations. One of these is from Mr. Elliot L. Richardson, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare:

"Ambassador Holland, may I extend heartiest congratulations on your selection as the recipient of the National Collegiate Athletic Association's Theodore Roosevelt Award. You are truly an All-American athlete and an outstanding representative of the nation's leaders and as a human being. I only wish I might be with you today to congratulate you in person for receiving this most prestigious and well-deserved accolade to your outstanding achievements. Ann joins me in sending to you and Laura our affection and good wishes.

Elliot."

The next message is from the Secretary of Defense:

"Dear Mr. Ambassador: Walter Byers has advised me of your selection as the 1972 winner of the Theodore Roosevelt Award. As one who has been close to the NCAA activities over the years, I am keenly aware of the high stature of this award. I commend NCAA for the soundness of their choice and congratulate you upon being the recipient.

Sincerely,
Melvin Laird."

We honor Brud today for his distinguished service and leadership in higher education, human relations and international affairs. This illustrious son of Cornell, dedicated always to physical fitness and competitive sports, has contributed significantly to higher education in the United States and to better understanding among men and nations.

May I ask you now, Ambassador Holland, to rise to receive the 1972 Theodore Roosevelt Award. Brud, we honor you with our highest award, and we are honored that you have come to receive it.

[The assembly rose and applauded as the award was presented to Ambassador Holland.]

The Honorable Jerome H. Holland (United States Ambassador to Sweden): President Ramer, Mr. Jackson, honored guests, the scholar-athletes, the nationally prominent journalists, the officers and members of the NCAA, ladies and gentlemen: I accept this outstanding award named in the honor of the late Theodore Roosevelt, the twenty-sixth President of the United States, as presented by the National Collegiate Athletic Association, with a sense of grateful appreciation and gratitude.

Theodore Roosevelt represented the spirit of this nation in its early stages of development. There was concern for his fellow man, his sense of fair play, his belief in our system of government, his commitment to a healthy environment and his recognition of the value of competitive athletics. Thus this award program has national and international significance.

To receive this honor as an individual is most flattering. However, programs in intercollegiate athletics are oriented within a group process, and this recognition of which I am the recipient must be shared by one's family, his teammates, other students, coaches, varsity members, administrative personnel and trustees of a college or university.

I am also cognizant of the fact that whatever achievements or accomplishments I have experienced since my undergraduate days in

Cornell University came in the frame of reference of group cooperation, which symbolizes the vitality and vigor of our time.

Intercollegiate football, the same as any other competitive collegiate athletics, is an integral part of the educational experience one receives in an institution of higher education. Intercollegiate athletics demands among other things a sense of giving, an organizational pattern of group participation, standards for health and physical development, a code of principles of conduct and a recognition of the value, judgment and decision-making concepts.

There is also always present the democratic principle of equality of opportunity which is the cornerstone of the representative form of government and a system embodying economic and social mobility.

Athletic participation should transcend all racial, religious and cultural differences. One is a member of the team because he has earned that place. Such experiences have been defined as important for community living in a competitive society.

Our nation within the past 100 years has witnessed some dramatic development in engineering, science, technology, health-related arts, man's productive techniques, communication arts, agriculture and in many other areas. These developments have brought forth to this nation the highest standard of living in the world and an eminent leadership position in the family of nations throughout the world.

While there are many serious problems confronting our citizenry today, I do face the future with confidence. We are capable in this nation of instituting and living with changes without destroying the foundation of this nation. We still believe in and respect the individual and his role in society; thus to me the eminent greatness of our society is to allow each individual to reach his highest maximum level of development. Our social institutions, such as the home, religion, government and economics, provide a framework for such individual development. The intercollegiate athletic program which stresses individual development within a group complex has played a most significant and dramatic role in preparing citizens to participate in our social force, and in the future intercollegiate athletics must assume an even greater role. This presents, I believe, a most dramatic challenge to such an association as the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

In the past 21 months that I have been serving as the United States Ambassador to Sweden, I have studied our society in a comparative frame of reference with other societies. I have attempted to be objective and recognize the positive and negative aspects. There is a guiding strength which is always present and that involves the importance of the individual and the opportunities we provide in our society for the development of that individual.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is one of the big suggestions one derives from the comparative study of America and other nations. I hope we never lose this feeling of importance of the individual. Thus to me the National Collegiate Athletic Association in this concept alone has a future mandate for approach.

I am deeply indebted to the officers and members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association for instituting the Theodore Roosevelt Award and to the members of the Honors Committee for considering me in this context. This today represents one of the most cherished

moments in my life, and I will always remember it. My family joins me in this expression of appreciation.

[The audience rose and applauded.]

President Ramer: It is our custom to recognize the undergraduate institution represented by the Theodore Roosevelt Award winner. To accept the institutional Theodore Roosevelt Award is the assistant to the president of Cornell University, Robert J. Kane, who also is dean of the department of physical education and athletics. Bob has served on the Olympic Committee since 1954 and currently is vice-president of that group.

Bob, I am happy, on behalf of our Association, to provide this recognition for you and your institution. [Applause]

Robert J. Kane (Cornell University): Thank you, President Ramer. Ladies and gentlemen, it is a cherished privilege for me to be here representing Cornell University today for this award to my good friend, Jerome H. Holland. I don't think I have ever called him that before. Brud, as we all call him, was an authentic All-American, and that is commendation enough about his football. But I suppose I am the only one who really saw him play every one of his games at Cornell, and to coin a phrase, he could do it all.

Whatever Brud has done, he has done in a very elegant and top-rate fashion, but most of all he was a team player, and there are three men sitting at the table who can testify to that because they played on the same team with him. I am talking about Curt Pershey, Lou Grossman and Paul Black. Will they stand? [Applause]

Earl Ramer has compared Brud to the past recipients of this distinguished award. I would like to carry that one step farther and compare him somewhat to the man whose name is attached to this award, Theodore Roosevelt.

Brud was born with a slightly deformed and undersized lower leg, to the point that in his early years, his infant years, his mother and grandmother had to massage his leg every day until it came back to normal condition. His family then encouraged him to take part in sports, which he did from his boyhood years.

Theodore Roosevelt was born with a debilitating asthmatic condition and very poor eyes, yet he became the very exemplar of vigorous life. So in this and many other leadership ways, Brud does exemplify what the Theodore Roosevelt Award is all about, because he has overcome obstacles—many, many obstacles—during his life and always came out with success.

His great courage, his persistence and electric personality and charm did not develop recently. I knew Brud from the time he came to Cornell, which was several years ago, and he could have been called, and he was, an American ambassador. He has changed as little as any man I have ever known, which I think is a great testimonial.

I have been asked to read a message from Dale Corson, president of Cornell University:

"Cornell is honored to have Ambassador Jerome H. Holland receive the NCAA's highest award. He had an outstanding undergraduate career in Cornell and many times we wished his football knowledgeability might have been continued in Cornell.

"He had other talents, too, and they have always been used in the service of Cornell. In recent years he has served as a mem-

ber of the board of trustees, and this service continues at the present time.

"During the period of Cornell's greatest troubles in recent years, his wise counsel and steadfast support have meant much to me personally. I regret I cannot be present today to honor Ambassador Holland."

So it is my great privilege to represent the university. To me he exemplifies everything the award is all about. I am just glad the members of the Awards Jury thought so, too, and I think it was just bully of them to think so. [Laughter and applause]

Toastmaster Jackson: We hope you have enjoyed this. We are delighted you could come. We hope you will make plans in the future to be with us again for the NCAA Honors Luncheon. I hope next year it won't be held in Hollywood, Florida, because I once had a granddaddy several years ago who had 800 acres of land just across the river and didn't know what to do with it. So I go over there and cry a lot. [Laughter]

Congratulations to all of these gentlemen who have been honored today. They have earned it. They have earned the respect of their colleagues and all those who will follow. Thank you very much.

President Ramer: Keith has done a wonderful job for us today, and we are grateful to you for taking time from your busy schedule, Keith, to be with us. We feel you should have an award, too, and so at this time we want to present you with this NCAA silver bowl, and we want this always to remind you of this occasion. We hope for you it will be just as pleasant as it has been for us.

[Presentation of silver bowl and applause]

I want on your behalf and all of ours at the head table to express our great appreciation to Walter Byers and all the others in our executive office for the wonderful management, as usual, for this occasion.

May I ask now for the benediction, and we will call Pastor Behnken to the podium once again. Please stand for the benediction. Pastor Behnken.

Rev. L. Lloyd Behnken: Lord, it has been good to be here together. We are mindful of the many scattered all over the world who might like to be here but cannot, especially those who are prisoners of war or listed among the missing. We seek a special blessing on them. So, Lord, bless us and keep us, make your face to shine upon us, and be gracious to us. Grant us your presence that gives us peace, now and always. Amen.

BUSINESS SESSION

Saturday Morning, January 8, 1972

The Business Session of the Sixty-sixth Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened in the Convention Hall of The Diplomat, Hollywood, Florida, at 9:20 a.m., Earl M. Ramer, NCAA President, presiding.

President Ramer: Gentlemen, we welcome you to this Sixty-sixth Annual Business Session of our Convention. I would like to report to you that we have 433 members represented at this Convention, and we have, counting voters and alternates, 613 representatives from member institutions and agencies, 82 nonvoting members, 35 registered members of the press, making a total of 748 in attendance, the largest attendance in the history of our organization.

I would like at this time to recognize a request from Miss Edith Hatton, our stenographer, and I want you to know that your Chair concurs heartily in our approval of this request, namely that as you speak to these various matters before us, you identify your name clearly, forcefully and the institution or agency you represent, so that she may record these representations faithfully in the record.

You will find our agenda on page 9 of the white sheets. A proposed reordering of that suggested to you during our first meeting will be considered after the committee reports.

I will proceed at this time to ask the Chairman of our Television Committee, Jim Decker, to come forward and give us the report of the Television Committee. The Chair recognizes Jim Decker, Chairman of the Television Committee.

9. REPORT OF THE TELEVISION COMMITTEE

James H. Decker (Syracuse University): President Ramer and Members: This past year there were major changes facing the relatively inexperienced NCAA Television Committee. A new plan had to be written, and the nation's unstable economy has resulted in a soft advertising market for television advertising sales.

Yet in partnership with the carrying network, ABC-TV, the Committee was able to surmount these difficulties and even add to the prominent position college football enjoys in the national sports scheme.

The Committee's proposed plan for 1972-73 was adopted by 92 per cent vote of the membership. Negotiation for the sale of television rights has been under way for the past several weeks and a satisfactory agreement is expected very soon. This expectation is based on the high interest factor in NCAA football, the studies of the industry, and the fact that ABC's improved sales report last year resulted in only two thirty-second commercial spots remaining unsold for the 1971 series out of 324 available 60-second spots.

The year was keynoted by the excellence of the football transmitted to the large viewing audience, topped by the presentation of five un-

beaten teams in nine days and the last three games of the series. ABC reached a scheduling height when it chose these contests the preceding March. I regret it was necessary to delay the distribution of the complete printed 1971 Television Committee Report because of a last minute editorial change. Copies will be distributed by mail to the entire membership.

On behalf of the Committee, I express its thanks to the membership for the extensive cooperation received in the administration of this dynamic program, and finally I salute the Committee members of whom so much was asked during this demanding year, and who responded so well.

[The motion was seconded, put to a voice vote and carried.]

10. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Revision of the Agenda

President Ramer: Gentlemen, you will recall that on Thursday we approved the reports of the meets and tournament committees identified in the Annual Reports for 1970-71. As you know, there are reports in that document from numerous other committees. These committee reports are included in pages 26 through 61 in the annual reports. The chairmen of these various committees propose the approval of these reports at this time, and I will now entertain a motion for the approval of these reports in toto.

[The motion was regularly made and seconded that the reports be approved; carried.]

We now approach the matter we discussed Thursday, namely the need for a revised order among the amendments and proposals presented to you in the program of the annual Convention.

I think at that time and in the district meeting discussions and perhaps other meetings you have attended you recognized the need for some reorganization of these proposals; first of all perhaps, to achieve time economy; and second, certainly to recognize the relatedness among these items as that relatedness should be appropriately recognized; and third, the need in some instances for prior action not recognized in the program.

In such revision of the order of our proposal, we need to adhere to established rules of procedure. We want in that process to be respectful to all individuals present and to all group interests.

I would like to recognize our Parliamentarian, Harry Cross, at this time to explain to us some of the parliamentary conditions involved in this change in the order of our agenda.

Harry M. Cross (University of Washington): The parliamentary situation, as I see it, seems to be this: In the white pages of the program, we have the order of business for the day. We have reached the third item, "Proposed Amendments Previously Circulated." The fourth item is "Review of Interpretations." The fifth item is "Other Proposals." These, of course, are the matters primarily of legislative concern to us. The last two items are with reference to the election of Officers and the committee on appointments, the work of the Committee on Committees.

How within these respective categories the items are presented is a matter for the determination of President Ramer, as chairman of the meeting. The numbers attached to the various ideas amount to a sug-

gestion as to an orderly procedure but are not binding on him or on the convention itself.

It is my understanding that President Ramer contemplates some deviation from the numbered sequence in the yellow pages. This he will be able to do, except by your appeal of his rule to the contrary, without any affirmative action by the convention.

There are, of course, on the summary sheets to which he referred, some proposals of sequence change which do not fall within the last proposition, inasmuch as they are not merely changes of sequence, but also include matters relating to Interpretations which are in a different category.

The consideration of those Interpretations along with the appropriate Constitution and Bylaws change does need action of the Convention which amounts to a change of the order specified. This could be achieved by an affirmative vote of the majority in favor of it, or it could be achieved by your unanimous consent.

If there are proposals to change in some other fashion, this can be done by means of what will amount to a motion to postpone for consideration those things which would appear in an earlier category. We are able by that means to develop the sequence that seems most useful and desirable to the Convention.

President Ramer: Thank you, Harry. Proceeding on that basis, the Chair would like to request, first of all, unanimous approval of the revised order which you have on the single white sheet. May I ask if there are those of you in the house who do not have copies of this? I believe there are a few in the back. Please raise your hands if you do not have copies of these sheets. Our floor representatives will get to you.

As you will note in the two columns in the presentation of this reordering the Council has attempted to achieve time economy and the establishment of relatedness and prior need for action to which we referred. The Chair is about to assume your unanimous acceptance of this revised order.

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. President, I have a question. If we give unanimous consent to this order, does it mean that a motion to rearrange certain items or reorder certain items would be out of order?

President Ramer: No, it does not. It means after your acceptance of this, motions for further reordering could be entertained. As a matter of fact, in one instance, after our approval of this, the Chair is going to request the placement of the Special Convention item at the very top of the list.

Assuming your consent to the reordering, let's refer to this sheet as the revised order of consideration of proposals. The Chair would like to assume further the movement in this order of Special Convention items, Nos. 76, 77 and 73, to the very beginning of our agenda, immediately above Advertising, in the left column.

Hearing no objection to the movement of these items, into the beginning of the agenda, I would like to ask Harry Cross, our Parliamentarian, but in this instance representing the Council, to present these proposals to the convention. Since he for the time being will be vacating the role of parliamentarian, I would like to ask our dis-

tinguished Past President and Parliamentarian, Marcus Plant, Professor of Law of the University of Michigan, to come to the podium, if he would, and serve in that interim as our parliamentarian. Mark, we are grateful to you for this.

[Mr. Plant assumed the duties of parliamentarian.]

Special Convention

Harry M. Cross (University of Washington): Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: Before I make the initial motion I am charged to make by the Council, I want to advise the Convention of the sequence the Council has determined and reaffirmed the matters should take.

On the green sheets that you have, which are the sheets including the proposed amendments to amendments, on the top page of course the Special Convention resolutions. It is as you were advised yesterday, the recommendation of the Council that first consideration be given to Resolution No. 76, which will authorize a special convention having before it proposed legislative reorganization and also proposals with reference to financial aid and related matters.

Mr. Chairman, I move the approval of Resolution labeled No. 76, having to do with a special convention as presented on the green sheets which have been distributed to the delegates.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Cross: Mr. President, as the Convention was informed, Council was of the mind that it would be desirable to have the two principal items of current concern for the welfare of the NCAA and its principle purpose considered as soon as reasonably may be; at our meeting last night that position was again affirmed and I was assigned the task of speaking in support of it.

As I pointed out, should the Council's judgment that this is the desirable route to take not be shared by the Convention, the two principal items which would be accomplished by combination under the one resolution will be before you individually and it is conceivable that the end result by actions on the two individual proposals will be the same result that would follow the adoption of the motion on the resolution now before you.

Certainly for a number of years there has been concern expressed by the delegates as to whether or not there should be a reorganization, a division of the Association into parts to a total or limited extent. It may be that the pressing need for some kind of change in the cost structures of intercollegiate athletics has finally precipitated action.

I believe it is important that this matter be studied and that possible reorganization be carefully considered by the membership to assure ourselves either that what we have is better than what the alternatives are or alternatives considered which will make possible rules that will improve our effectiveness not only in the general overall sense but the support the NCAA can give to the individual programs of our member institutions.

I personally am not persuaded that that is the first thing that needs to be done. I have been additionally persuaded by persons, with greater experience and longer experience than mine, that this probably is the thing that should be done first, because if anything is to be done about financial aid controls it may very well be there should be differences

between the different types of institutions that we have and this would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish without some sort of division.

Accepting that as so, I share the position of the Council, that that should be the first item of business or at least be the first principal item of business at a special convention we might have unless there is some overwhelming reason why it should not be.

Now, I point out, that while the question before us is not the substance of either legislative reorganization or financial controls, restrictions of one sort of another, there is certain difficulty in talking about the desirability or necessity of having a convention without at least a modest amount of speculation as to what might occur there. So I do not mean to argue here the merits of any of the several ideas that have been advanced or discussed either in the more formal sessions or informally, but I point out that one of the things that is suggested is that there are identifiable classifications or categories among our institutions whose attacks on common problems of expense are likely to be essentially identical and fall into place with minimum difficulties.

As we all know, the typical source of argument about the desirability of some kind of financial aid limitations seems to turn on whether the "need schools" can live with that which the "grants-in-aid schools" can live, and vice versa, but this is all supposed to fall in place if you put all the major colleges in one category and all the minor colleges in another and divide the two categories. So I merely point out to you for your consideration, gentlemen, that in my own conference Stanford is a "need school," and none of the rest of us are, and I don't suppose anybody would be of the mind to characterize Stanford as not a major football institution.

I would also point out that if we talk of not having our rules made by the ones who do not understand our situation and we still have restrictions put upon us that are difficult with which to live, it may be if we reorganize into smaller groups we may find that our freedom is restricted rather than increased. One of the difficulties we have had as an organization for years is the circumstance of writing a rule that attacks a problem which is identified as needing a solution, with a sufficient amount of flexibility or tolerance put into it so diverse institutions can live with it rather than a tight, narrow rule that might be a better one looking at that particular problem itself.

So it is not clear to me that we ought to have any kind of legislative reorganization at all, but I do think it is an important problem that we must face as promptly as we can. We come therefore to the point that I think it is very, very urgent, that we have a special convention to consider this along with such other things as seem appropriate.

This I think, is primarily a matter of our internal housekeeping and affairs between ourselves, whether we can form ourselves into a structure that can be most effective to accomplish our primary purposes, which are as I see it, to promote the development and sustenance of sound and vigorous intercollegiate athletic programs, not necessarily to advance our own selfish interests in this kind of structure.

The study that was made under Art Nebel's direction with reference to the financial costs of the past decade merely gave us statistical support for what most of us knew was happening anyhow, that the costs

are out of hand and something must be done. Certainly the athletic directors know that, even the people who read the newspapers and see just the sports pages know that this college and that college and this university and that university have dropped their sports or some of their sports—football seems to be the last one dropped because it is the one that produces revenue whereas the others do not.

If we wish to preserve intercollegiate athletics in the vigorous state, which I think those of us who spend as much time in it as we do must believe, we must face the financial cost problem. If we do not face it, somebody else is going to resolve it for us, and you know as well or maybe even better than I that the ones who resolve it are not likely to be particularly sympathetic toward intercollegiate athletics.

The question was raised in our panel discussion: Why not ask the students what we should do about financial aid? I ask: What students should we ask? If you want to take a democratic approach to it, you find the athletes are not going to be the ones who can control the advice you are going to get. The institutions which in part have their athletic programs financed by particular student fees are feeling more and more the stress of a reduction in sympathy or support for intercollegiate athletics because of some major distortion of what its values are; a misconception of what it actually does, what actually goes on, by the students who tend to have a voice in how those fees should be used.

That may not be a matter of great seriousness to those institutions who do not allocate students' fees in any particular fashion, but certainly the administrative people at the president's level, I would venture most of the faculties, and probably quite a few of the athletic directors are aware of the extent to which, no matter what is done with the money the student pays to the college or university he thinks he ought to have a very sizable voice in what his university does. The circumstance that he pays a flat tuition and there isn't anything theoretically allocated to intercollegiate athletics, or if it becomes merely a part of the general departmental program of financial support from the master budget of the university does not eliminate the likelihood of very serious criticism of intercollegiate athletics because you are spending money on something that does not have an academic atmosphere or learning experience available to students that is worth having or spending even my part of the money that it takes to run this university.

So, there are substantial dangers in intercollegiate athletics which are only aggravated by cost factors which we must try to solve. If we do not, as I say, someone will solve them for us. I would suggest, gentlemen, that we may not be able to solve them in a fashion we think is tolerable, but we would be more than just insufficient in facing our task; we would be seriously derelict in facing our task unless we try, unless we try as soon as we reasonably may. If you analyze the financial aid proposal with some care you perhaps will understand why I feel this is not only important but it is pressing in time, it is urgent.

Make the assumption we would need a special convention and adopt some or all of those proposals before the end of the first half of this year. Look at your time table. As a practical matter, most of those proposals relate to students who will enter the institutions for the

first time in the fall of 1973. They do not propose, nor can they fairly propose, that the financial situation with reference to student-athletes already in your institutions be changed. So in order for those to be fully effective you are talking about a span of some four or five years beginning with 1973 autumn term. If you postpone whatever action may come in this area, if you postpone even until next January, as a practical matter the first dating that can come from this is likely to be in 1974.

President Tate, who was on this expense committee, President of Southern Methodist University—and if there is a stronger presidential friend of intercollegiate athletics in the United States it would be a great pleasure and privilege to meet him—made very clear to this Committee that the cost of this program and its competitive standing as against the other costs of the university is becoming harder and harder to protect. The Association of American Colleges, which is made up of some, I think, eight or nine hundred colleges and universities around the United States, of which Dr. Tate is one of the members or presiding officers, had three long tables on athletic cost problems. It has been before the Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities. It has been before—not as much as I had hoped it would be—but it has been before the Association of American Universities which is considered the prestige group. And if you think there are not other people worrying about costs and about doing something about it, you just haven't been listening.

I can recognize how and why the coaches do not want the change. None of us like change which gives us a new set of rules to work with that might be awkward, even though we might be willing to support the ultimate goal. I do not understand why faculty representatives are not urging their directors and prodding them to get their coaches in line. The atmosphere that is developing on our campuses is not going to decrease. That attitude is so dangerous to the future success of intercollegiate athletics, and the costs come out as a major factor in that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the members of the Convention to vote in favor of the early special convention, at which there will be authorization to consider both problems, and may I point out a special convention can consider only those things which are specifically ordered in the call for the convention. Thank you.

President Ramer: Thank you, Professor Cross. We are discussing Proposal No. 76 (page A-31) of the resolutions relating to a special convention. Is there further discussion?

[A voice vote was taken on Proposal No. 76 and failed to carry.]

President Ramer: The Chair recognizes Dr. Cross for the presentation of No. 77.

Mr. Cross: Mr. Chairman, I move the approval of Resolution No. 77, calling for a special convention to consider matters of legislative re-organization of our Association.

President Ramer: You have heard the motion to approve No. 77. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 77 (pages A-31 and A-32) was defeated 135-219.]

President Ramer: The Chair recognizes Professor Cross who will represent the Council in presenting Item 73 to the Convention.

Mr. Cross: Mr. Chairman, I move approval of Resolution No. 73. [The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 73 (pages A-29 and A-30) was defeated by voice vote.]

Advertising

President Ramer: Gentlemen, we now move in the revised order to consideration of proposals relating to Advertising, Nos. 1 and 45 in the established program, the yellow sheets. The Chair recognizes Mr. Casale.

Ernest C. Casale (Temple University): Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the Constitution, Article 3, Section 1-(d), as presented in Proposal No. 1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Casale: As noted, there is a companion amendment known as No. 45. Now if you have read this you would have noted that No. 45 is an amendment to O.I. 7. In order to make No. 45 applicable, it would be necessary to make a change in the original constitution articles, namely the one right here, Article 3, Section 1-(e). I will not read the proposal. It is there—nor the intent which you have all I am sure read. However, just a word of further explanation.

This amendment would allow such things as a gas station attendant giving away photos of a team or its captain or an individual on the team; possibly an auto agency taking a page in your program saluting the team with a picture or a player; possibly the football guide saluting the team.

So I must make this very clear. In no way would there be any endorsement by any athlete. No athlete can be involved in any way. That means that an athlete cannot hand out photos, he cannot be seen holding a photo in his hand or anything like that.

President Ramer: Thank you, Mr. Casale. With Mr. Casale's consent and yours, the Chair will assume the motion is to approve Constitutional item to cover items Nos. 1 and 45. Is that satisfactory with you, Ernie?

Mr. Casale: Yes.

President Ramer: Hearing no objection, the Chair assumes the motion to cover both items, No. 1 and No. 45.

[Proposals No. 1 (page A-1) and No. 45 (page A-21) were approved by vote of 315-50.]

Financial Aid

President Ramer: We move now to the Financial Aid proposal, No. 2, back in the Official Program. The Council I believe endorses this proposal. Is there someone presenting this for the Council? I should have said this is a proposal of the Atlantic Coast Conference with the endorsement of the Council. The Chair now recognizes Bob James, Commissioner of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Robert C. James (Atlantic Coast Conference): Mr. President, we move to amend Article 3, Section 1-(f) of the Constitution as it appears in the agenda, Item No. 2.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. James: Mr. Chairman, by submitting this proposal we simply wish to have something prepared so that our athletic directors could counsel student athletes who withdraw from the squad that their aid may be removed if their financial aid committee so directs. The young

man is obviously recruited. He was awarded aid because it was determined he could participate on the athletic squad of that institution. Therefore, we feel that with this amendment we could encourage that young man to reassociate with the team. This is our intention.

[Proposal No. 2 (page A-1) was approved by voice vote.]

Awards

President Ramer: We now move to the next proposal, No. 3. The Chair recognizes Boyd McWhorter, who will represent the Council in presenting this amendment on the floor of the convention.

H. Boyd McWhorter (University of Georgia): Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment to the Constitution, Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(7)-(ii). [The motion was seconded.]

Mr. McWhorter: Gentlemen, I feel this is self-explanatory and the intent of this legislation is spelled out on page 18. It is to loosen up the award legislation so the institution itself can make such an award under such circumstances as explained in the amendment.

[Proposal No. 3 (page A-2) was approved by voice vote.]

Undergraduate Eligibility

President Ramer: We move next to the consideration of related items Nos. 4, 5, and 29. The Chair recognizes, first, Bob Pritchard, member of the Council, who will present this to the floor of the convention.

Robert W. Pritchard (Worcester Polytechnic Institute): Mr. Chairman, I move that the Constitution Article 3, Section 3-(c) be amended as stated in the bulletin.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Pritchard: The intent is stated: To require a student-athlete to be an undergraduate to be eligible for competition.

President Ramer: Thank you, Bob. Is there other discussion? [Proposal No. 4 (page A-2) was approved by voice vote.]

Postgraduate Eligibility

President Ramer: We move to Item No. 5. This item will be presented to the convention by Jack Fuzak, who will represent the Council.

John A. Fuzak (Michigan State University): Mr. Chairman, I move an amendment to the amendment. The amendment referred to is in the green pages, at the top of page 2, labeled Postgraduate Eligibility. The amendment is to Proposal 5 in your yellow pages.

I would like to move the amendment to the amendment as indicated in the green pages.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Fuzak: The amendment to the amendment clarifies the intent of the original proposal by specifying after enrollment in a collegiate institution and makes it clear after reception of his baccalaureate or equivalent degree. I think that is self-explanatory.

[Amendment C (page A-33) was approved by voice vote.]

Mr. Fuzak: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the approval of No. 5 as amended, which provides the opportunity for continued competition under the conditions specified; that is, within the four-year period of remaining in the same institution.

[The motion was seconded.]

John E. Kane (University of Arkansas): I don't want to be picky about this, but I am asking as a member of the Constitution and By-laws Committee. The motion as amended does not specify in the first line that the degree would be a baccalaureate degree. I believe Mr. Fuzak indicated that was the intent, but I just for my own satisfaction want to check on that. Would it be appropriate for an editorial change to be made to add the word "baccalaureate"?

Mr. Fuzak: In the amendment to the amendment which we adopted it does say baccalaureate degree or equivalent degree.

Mr. Kane: Not in the first line.

Mr. Fuzak: Oh, I misunderstood.

Mr. Kane: Yes, it is not quite clear I think with the first line reading as it does. If you think otherwise, I will withdraw my question.

President Ramer: The Chair rules there may be an editorial change, if that is satisfactory to Mr. Fuzak. Jack, will you accede to that?

Mr. Fuzak: I have no objection.

Mr. Kane: Thank you.

[Proposal No. 5, as amended, (page A-2) was approved by voice vote.]

Individual Eligibility

President Ramer: We move next to Item 29. You will note there is also an amendment involved in this, Amendment N. The Chair will recognize Bill Ketz, who will represent the Council in speaking for the amendment and the main motion.

Wilford H. Ketz (Union College): Mr. Chairman, I move amendment to the Bylaws Article 4, Section 1-(g) No. 29, which increases from 30 to 60 days the period he may still compete in NCAA events after the completion of his requirements. I so move, Mr. Chairman.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Ketz: Mr. Chairman, as a result of the discussions yesterday in some of the district meetings it was brought out there was a discrepancy in the passing of Proposal No. 5 that the amendment which I have just made is out of step. Therefore, I shall propose an amendment to the amendment which is labeled N, if you will please look at that. Amendment N. Now, the amendment to the amendment reads:

"He must not have received or satisfied the requirements for a baccalaureate or equivalent degree (or he must not have completed his eligibility for participation as a graduate student under the provisions of Article 3, Section 3-(c) of the Constitution) except that a student who is eligible during the term in which he completes his work for the degree (or his graduate eligibility as referred to above) remains eligible for any NCAA event that begins within sixty days after he completes the requirement for the degree (or his graduate eligibility)."

I so move, Mr. Chairman.

[The motion was seconded and Amendment N (page A-36) was approved by voice vote.]

We are now facing the original motion as amended. Is there any discussion?

[Proposal No. 29 (page A-13), as amended, was approved by voice vote.]

Five-Year Rule, Transfer Rule

[Proposals No. 6 (pages A-2 and 3) and No. 59 (page A-25) were withdrawn without dissent.]

Summer Basketball

President Ramer: We move now to Items 7, 8 and 47, relating to summer basketball. Item 7. Is there a representative from ECAC or MacMurray College or the National Association of Basketball Coaches to present No. 7?

William L. Wall (MacMurray College): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the National Association of Basketball Coaches, we move the adoption of Article 3, Section 9-(c), as stated in No. 7.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Wall: Mr. Chairman, in the past few years our national convention would meet at the site of the basketball tournament, and our membership almost unanimously requested this legislation. We would like to see basketball no longer legislated against in the summer.

Richard Koenig (Valparaiso University): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Council, I strongly urge the delegates to defeat this proposal. Many of you who have been here before will recognize this as the same proposal which has been in front of you in the last two years. At the same time I will not repeat all the arguments which have been advanced against the proposal in the past by such groups as the University Division Tournament Committee, the various other committees, various other individuals intimately connected with basketball, but I do think it is important for the group to remember that we acted as a national body in 1962 out of a sense of urgency because of the gambling and bribery scandal which faced basketball in those days.

Some of you will remember, along with me, that we had the district attorney of New York in front of us and he pointed out that 90 per cent of the contacts that were made came about as a result of summer basketball.

I think it is also important to remember that the existing legislation prohibits only organized summer basketball and that the Council in existing legislation can approve worthwhile organized summer basketball.

I know that one of the arguments in favor of this proposal is that we are trying to build into it many safeguards but I remind you that what seems to be a controlled summer basketball program does permit the creation of the very vehicle which brought undesirable contacts and elements to basketball.

Gentlemen, basketball has enjoyed healthy support in the past ten years since we put in this regulation. Basketball is thriving under existing rules. Basketball is growing under existing rules, and 99.8 per cent of our membership is participating in basketball. The playing and practice season for organized collegiate basketball is sufficiently long at the present time. I therefore urge you gentlemen, on behalf of the Council, to vote against this proposal.

Michael Fleischer (Herbert H. Lehman College): Mr. President, while I am familiar with some of the arguments that the Council has put forth, I would like to say several things.

Firstly, basketball is in a rather unique situation. Many of the student athletes come from marginal areas in the summer during which they wish to participate in the competitive system in organized fashion. The proposal would allow this and would put the safeguard of

having approved these, much as we have today in the baseball situation and have had for several years.

I would also like to say that the question of the student athlete being approached in summer leagues is rather old history and that the student athlete can be approached almost any time. To argue against it in the approved league seems to me rather to defeat the argument. I, therefore, urge the organization to approve this amendment.

Robert A. Latour (Bucknell University): I would like to express myself in support of this legislation. There are some in the assembly here today who feel that, as far as gamblers contacting basketball players, we should curtail summer basketball. There is nothing sacred about June, July and August. If the gamblers wish to contact collegiate basketball players they have numerous opportunities between September and May.

There is no other sport in the NCAA program that has severe restrictions for off-season play. Summer competition is available for baseball, soccer, and so forth. The controls expressed in the amendment will enable our collegiate basketball players to play in organized summer programs.

The College Basketball Coaches Association voiced approval of this legislation and I urge its acceptance by the assembly.

[Proposal No. 7 (page A-3) was defeated by hand vote.]

President Ramer: We move to Item No. 8 on page 20 of your yellow pages. The Chair will recognize a representative of the University of Minnesota, Duluth.

Ralph Romano (University of Minnesota-Duluth): I would like to ask if the convention might consider an amendment to this item. Inadvertently the amendment was written so that it does not meet the intent. I ask for an understanding from the convention. I was informed only at the district meeting yesterday. It was indicated that I should have been informed previously and allowed to amend. I was not informed and did not have an opportunity to amend. As it is now written it does not differ from Item 7, and the intent was to have it differ and have it a College Division player.

President Ramer: Yes, that has been discussed with our parliamentarian, and he has ruled this is admissible, if we have no objection from the convention floor. I am going to rule immediately on it, that it is admissible. Hearing no objection, please proceed with the worded amendment.

Mr. Romano: I would like to amend it so it would read: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(c), Item 8, and it would say—we would strike "must not" and replace with "may"; we would strike the wording from "except" through "or" so it would read:

A College Division player may participate in organized basketball competition during the period of June 15 to August 31, and so on.

In that way it would relate only to College Division players.

President Ramer: All right. You have heard the correction, making the bearing of the motion exclusively on College Division players. I will accept this as a motion. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

Richard Koenig (Valparaiso University): Mr. Chairman, for the same reasons I raised previously, I am speaking against it, the amend-

ment, and to save myself time I am not going to go back and speak against the proposal again.

I will add one more reason to it. I don't think the College Division players ought to get a special pass for the summer if we are not going to abide across the board. The reasons I spoke against the original proposal are just as valid here.

[Proposal No. 8 (page A-4) was defeated by voice vote.]

President Ramer: We move to Item No. 47, and the Chair will recognize Dwight Reed of Lincoln University, speaking on this proposal in representing the Council.

Dwight T. Reed (Lincoln University): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Item No. 47, which will add a new O.I. 16 to Article 3, Section 9-(c).

[Proposal No. 47 (page A-21) was seconded, put to a voice vote and carried.]

Individual Eligibility

President Ramer: We are moving to the assembly of items on Recruiting which you will find in the revised order of business. The first of these is No. 9, and the Chair will recognize Bob James, representing the Council and the Special Recruiting Committee, to present this before the Convention.

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference): Mr. Chairman, I recommend the acceptance of the amendment to Article 3, Section 9 of the Constitution as it appears in Item No. 9.

[The motion was seconded.]

Edwin Crowder (University of Colorado): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask what the procedure is. This is a penalty against a young man who is in violation of Proposal No. 13, which has not yet been enacted. I wonder if it would be fitting with the approval of the parliamentarian that we delay action on this until No. 13 is acted on, because if No. 13 is not approved then No. 9 has no reason for existence.

President Ramer: This would be the constitutional provision basic to No. 13. I am going to ask our parliamentarian about that.

Mr. Crowder, our parliamentarian feels this Constitutional revision would have relevance even though no changes were made in the Bylaws. The Chair rules therefore we will continue to face Item No. 9 as a Constitutional provision first.

Bob, do you have an additional comment to make on No. 9?

Mr. James: No, it is rather difficult to discuss it until the other one comes in, but I have no further comment because I think it speaks for itself.

[Proposal No. 9 (pages A-4 and A-5) failed for lack of a two-thirds majority 199-144.]

Sports Camps

President Ramer: Next in the order of the recruiting proposals, Item No. 12.

Harry Arlanson (Tufts University): Mr. Chairman and Delegates: This proposal of the Bylaws is to amend Article 1, Section 1, by adding a new paragraph (d), page 27, as follows:

"No member institution shall permit the use of its facilities for, nor may its employees participate in, directly or indirectly, a sports camp or clinic in which there is employed a high school athletic award winner who has finished his sophomore year in high school."

The obvious intent here is to restrict the use of summer camps for recruiting purposes.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I move the approval of the proposal.

[The motion was seconded.]

William L. Wall (MacMurray College): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak against the motion. I think many of our coaches, both football and basketball, have summer camps that are lucrative both to the university and the coaches' salaries. I think this is not a problem area.

I am disappointed that the Special Recruiting Committee did not have a publication mailed to the membership so it could be reviewed, in the form the Financial Aid Committee did.

My people feel this would be a loss of revenue. I don't think the sophomore—we just simply don't want to run these kids into the professional camp which are getting more and more numerous every day, and we are concerned in the area of professional camps. I thank you.

Thomas Niland (LeMoyne College, Syracuse): I speak against this motion because many of us allow our facilities to be used by outside organizations and it means financial help to the college. We, for example, do not have wrestling, but lease our facilities to a separate group, and it is a very rewarding financial help. If you restrict us from something we do not even participate in because of the facilities we use, it is really putting a financial burden on us and many other institutions which do not really control their own facilities.

Harry Arlanson (Tufts College): Just one point. As we all know, this is the kind of legislation that has come up over the years and must be defeated periodically, but we all recognize the evils involved in the sports camps and clinics. In no way does this apply to the diversified camps of which there are so many across the land. Those camps are legitimate camps, and in no way does this affect the operation of those. But we all realize this problem can be very severe in many of the summer camps and clinics, and the Special Committee on Recruiting saw this and recognized it, and knew there were problems to be met in the opposition to the matter of summer camps and their use, and we submit this for your decision.

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference, Chairman of the Special Recruiting Committee): Mr. Chairman, this does not in any way prohibit or restrict a young man from going to the summer camp. All it does is prohibit the employment of the student athlete by that camp. This was brought to our attention by the Association, and that is why we incorporated it. Coaches who have had summer camps have had that problem, and coaches who have not had summer camps have indicated they were being forced to have summer camps because they were taking the junior and employing him for the summer, so they had to compete. It was brought to us by the Coaches Association.

Max O. Schultze (University of Minnesota-Minneapolis): I am not so much concerned about the recruiting aspects of this proposal, but I would like to urge its defeat for this reason: A coach who may participate in one of these camps does not necessarily know that the camp management has employed as a dishwasher some young man who earned a letter as an athlete in whatever the sport may be. He has no idea that this occurs. Now, if he is employed and he is a dishwasher and in existence there, we are in violation of the rules, and

we are going to get clobbered, and we don't relish that, Mr. Chairman. [Laughter]

Michael Fleischer (Herbert H. Lehman College): Mr. Chairman, while I think the intent of the legislation is admirable, I think the shotgun approach here is objectionable. A great many of us, especially in the public institutions, have no control departmentwise over the use of the facilities. The institution controls it. The president or the dean controls it, and we have no say as to whom they will rent these facilities. Also the broad use of the term "employees" would mean janitorial, as I see it, or any custodial employees of the institution. Now, we don't have control of that in the athletic department. So I urge that this be defeated.

[Proposal No. 12 (page A-5) was defeated by hand vote.]

Coaching Schools

President Ramer: We move to Item 51, a proposal to restrict further the participation of coaches in clinics involving high school students. Is there a representative from the Southern Conference or the Collegiate Commissioners Association to present this on the floor of the convention? The Chair recognizes Commissioner Jordan of the Southern Conference.

Lloyd P. Jordan (Southern Conference): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Collegiate Commissioners Association has reviewed this situation over the years and proposes this amendment, sir, to amend O.I. 112, page 29, as follows:—You have it before you. I move it be accepted. Thank you.

[The motion was seconded and Proposal No. 51 (page A-22) was approved 179-172.]

Campus Visitations

President Ramer: We move now to Item 13, another item in this sequence, having to do with recruiting. Once again the Chair recognizes Bob James, Chairman of our Special Recruiting Committee.

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference): Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment to the Bylaws, Article 1, Section 5-(c), Item 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Ramer: The Chair recognizes the second then to the motion. I believe we have an amendment to be presented.

Charles Oldfather (Big Eight Conference): Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this particular proposal seems to contain two quite distinct factors, I would like to request that the Chair permit the division of it into two parts, one a vote on whether to change the number of expense-paid visits, and another a vote on the question of how many different institutions a particular prospect may visit.

I would like to make that in the form of a motion, if that would be more appropriate, a motion to divide.

President Ramer: Gentlemen, you have heard the motion to divide, in voting on No. 13. That does not relate to Amendment E, does it?

Mr. Oldfather: No.

President Ramer: That is quite different. Now, will you repeat, if you will, the basis for that division?

Mr. Oldfather: I think it contains two distinct questions, and one's attitude about one might affect his attitude about the other. There is

a basic question, and part of my motion is that we consider the change from two to one campus visit as the first item, and that it be divided so we can consider first whether to reduce from two to one, and second whether to place a limitation on the number of institutions.

[The motion was seconded, and the motion to divide was approved by voice vote.]

Mr. Oldfather: Mr. Chairman, we have in behalf of the Big Eight Conference an amendment to that. However, in view of the fact that we are only considering now whether to go from two to one, the effect of our amendment is to restore the two, and thus there is no point in presenting an amendment to that question. I am merely speaking in opposition to reducing two to one expense-paid visit, and in this regard I would be quite willing to defer to my more eloquent colleague in the conference, Mr. Ed Crowder.

Edwin Crowder (University of Colorado): I might point out that the restriction to one paid visit restricts the travel of a young man from his home town, which may be only 25 or 50 miles away or a nearby community, by a neighbor or that type of thing. This is a very restrictive rule. I am going to speak against this because it is quite restrictive. Actually I do not find it cumbersome at all in the recruiting process. We have had no difficulty at all. I see no reason to greatly restrict it, because it is not a great expenditure of institutional funds. In reducing the expense-paid visits from two to one, the first visit might be made by the prospective student and the second visit would have to be made by an interested party. That does not mean a greater expenditure of institutional funds.

President Ramer: Thank you, Mr. Crowder. Is there further discussion? We are addressing ourselves, gentlemen, to the first aspect of this, to the reduction from two to one, on the expense-paid visits.

[The motion was approved by hand vote.]

Now we move to the second part of the revision, having to do with the number of visits to campuses.

Edwin Cady (Indiana University): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have had several years to think this thing over and I find several things objectionable to trying to restrict the student athlete to visits to five institutions in toto. I have never understood the number. Why five? I suppose it is one of those things that recommends itself to a magical number. It seems like a nice number to pick out of the air, but I never have been able to see any other reason why it should be five, rather than another number, any other nice number you could think of like seven or nine.

The worst aspect of this, it seems to me, however, comes in its effect on recruiting. It seems to me one of the principal motivations for recruiting rules ought to be precisely what is seen in the quite scandalous harassment of athletes by recruiters in certain cases. This is a national scandal. It seems to me that if this were enacted we would simply have a new pressure point in the recruitment process, another way of harassment. That is to say it would become very important for recruiters to persuade the prospective student athlete to put his name on Old Siwash's list. It might become very important to the recruiter to keep the boy from putting his name on somebody else's list. I think there would be a great deal of pressure, concern, communication and in the long run harassment.

I have never been able to believe—I am not very good at arithmetic, being an English professor—but I have never been able to believe, because I cannot make the numbers come out, that there would in fact be any substantial economic saving for anybody in this kind of rule.

It seems to me, in other words, to be really in the best interest of the Association not to adopt it. I think we ought to vote against it.

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference): Mr. Chairman, we have representatives from the Football Coaches Association and the Basketball Coaches Association on our committee. We have College Division representatives, University Division representatives, athletic directors and faculty representatives.

We attempted to bring forth to you that which you indicated you wished to have done. I personally interviewed a number of the most highly recruited athletes in this country. I asked them, first, honestly to inform me how many institutions they were sincerely interested in attending when they started their visitations. Rarely—and I believe in only one or two instances—did that exceed the number three. I was absolutely surprised at the number who indicated one.

When we started out we were approached by the high schools. The High School Athletic Coaches Association, in their June meeting in 1971, unanimously adopted the following resolution to us: that there should be a limit of three expense-paid visits to different colleges for each of our athletes.

They are vitally concerned with the problem. We picked the number five because it was apparent to us that a state which had a number of large institutions or a state which might encompass four institutions of the same member conference could very well use up all of the expense-paid visits of the youngster and thus deny him a visit to another school.

I don't know if five is the proper number, Mr. Cady, but we had to start some place. This is where we started.

Edwin Crowder (University of Colorado): Mr. Chairman, I might make this one quick observation from the football coach's point of view. We have had a football squad of approximately 100 men, and they are I hope recruited with an interest in other schools as well, or other schools are interested in them. We polled those men to find out how many in fact had visited as many as five schools or more, and we had two or three. Of that number now we are asking that each of these men fill out an affidavit with each institution he visited, and that institution keep it on hand in order to indicate he has not violated.

I would suggest to you that we have 75 men visiting the campus each year and each of those men indicates that he visits approximately three schools on the average. That would mean 225 affidavits, and if there are 200 schools involved in that, that would mean everybody collectively would have on hand 45,000 affidavits, just to prove that two or three men out of 100 did not visit more schools than that.

I agree with what Dr. Cady had to say, in that those men who are recruiting right now find themselves under constant pressure introduced by each new legislative enactment, which forces the men to fight to be sure that we have one of his five visits. It adds another pressure, all for the benefit of saying two or three out of 100 do not do it.

I would appeal to the membership to vote down this proposal because we are beginning to over-legislate.

Stan Bates (Western Athletic Conference): We did defeat No. 9, where the penalty was on the boy. Does this mean, if this passes, the penalty goes against the institution?

Mr. James: There would have to be some provision made, Stan, either for possible reconsideration of No. 9, in view of this, or some enforcement procedure would have to be developed, or it would go to the institution, I would believe. Is that right?

President Ramer: The proposal before the house, the second portion of the amendment, is concerned with the limitation of visits to five campuses. Is there further discussion?

[The second portion of Proposal No. 13 (pages A-5 and A-6) was defeated by hand vote.]

President Ramer: Now, I am assuming from the statement that Professor Oldfather made for us, that Amendment E has now been superseded by our action, and with your consent we will abandon attention to Amendment E.

Harold H. Lahar (Colgate University): There is a third part of this Amendment No. 13, which relates to when the prospective student may visit, that he cannot visit the institution until the opening date or after the opening date of classes of the senior year in high school.

President Ramer: Is this Item 13 to which you refer?

Mr. Lahar: Yes, we voted on two different parts of No. 13. My question is: There is a third part. What disposition have we taken as far as the third portion of this amendment is concerned?

President Ramer: Well, the Chair assumes that no action has been taken in regard to that. Let me check with our parliamentarian, please. [Conferring]

The parliamentarian feels that that has been approved since the only feature of the amendment having been lost is the one relating to the five-campus visitation, and that portion of it now stands approved.

Several Members: No!

President Ramer: All right, gentlemen, since that is a third feature of this with interest, the Chair will entertain a motion concerned with that particular aspect.

Mr. Lahar: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move we vote on that portion of the amendment.

President Ramer: All right. Now state the wording of that, if you will, a little closer to the microphone.

Mr. Lahar: I would like to move that we vote on this portion of the amendment which reads: "A prospective student-athlete may not be provided an expense-paid visit earlier than the opening day of classes of his senior year in high school."

President Ramer: All right.

Mr. Lahar: I would like to—

President Ramer: What is the motion, sir?

Mr. Lahar: I would like to move that we vote on this portion of this amendment. We have not disposed of this portion of the amendment.

President Ramer: That the prospective student-athlete may not be provided expense-paid visits earlier than the opening date of classes of his senior year in high school. All right.

The Chair rules that since I have stated its approval it really should be an appeal from the decision made by the Chair, and I will entertain your motion that such an appeal be made, and you will vote on it in that manner, if that is satisfactory. This will place it then before the house. Is there a second to that motion, an appeal to the ruling of the Chair?

[The motion was seconded, put to a vote and carried.]
Mr. Lahar: I would like to move, Mr. President—

President Ramer: I am honoring now your motion that a prospective student-athlete may not be provided an expense-paid visit earlier than the opening day of classes in his senior year. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Lahar: I would like to speak in opposition to this provision, this amendment. Many of us are only able to provide summer visitation for students, and also if a student visits, the legislation which would come before us at a later time specifies, if passed, that if a student pays his own expenses to your campus and you entertain him in any way at that particular time that is accountable. Therefore, it makes it very difficult for us to abide by this type of legislation, inasmuch as in many cases summer visitations do take place. The passage of this amendment prohibits specifically any summer visitations for senior students, junior or senior students, preparing for entrance to a college or university.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

President Ramer: Thank you, sir. Is there further discussion?

[The third portion of Proposal No. 13 (pages A-5 and A-6) was approved by voice vote.]

Charles Neinas (Big Eight Conference): [Interposing] Mr. Chairman, if I understand the treatment by the convention of Item No. 13, the convention has now ruled there is one expense-paid visit per institution, the prospect may visit any number of institutions, but he may not do so until he becomes a senior in high school. Is that correct?

President Ramer: I think that is correct.

Mr. Neinas: That is correct.

President Ramer: Yes, sir.

Mr. Neinas: All right. Sir, I would like to request reconsideration of the first portion of it, requesting the reconsideration of the two-visit rule.

President Ramer: There is a motion for the reconsideration of the first portion of this. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

Robley Williams (University of California, Berkeley): Just subsequent to your announcement on the last vote as passed by voice vote, there were numerous calls for a division; that is, a type of counting the vote. I believe anyone has the right to make such a request, and that it be honored unless it is absolutely ridiculous. I don't believe that voice vote was all that overwhelmingly favorable. I should like to ask the Chair to call, before entertaining the motion made by Mr. Neinas, for a count of the vote.

President Ramer: Professor Williams, I am sorry I did not hear that call for the division. I think it is quite in order. I am going to return, gentlemen, to the last vote. It was a close vote. You remember the third division, the prospective student-athlete not to be provided

an expense-paid visit earlier than the opening day of classes in his senior year. I am going to ask those of you who favor this to indicate that affirmative response by a show of hands, please. Thank you. Those opposed to this, similarly by a show of hands, please. Thank you. The Chair rules an affirmative vote on that portion of it.

All right. We are back to the motion to reconsider. Is there discussion of Commissioner Neinas' motion to reconsider our action on Item 1?

Charles Neinas (Big Eight Conference): Mr. Chairman, I think there is some confusion which exists as a result of the fact that Item 9 was defeated. Therefore, I suggest the reconsideration of allowing the two expense paid visits to an institution.

President Ramer: Chuck, this is your motion to reconsider our first portion of this? Right? And we have moved into our reconsideration of this, and our parliamentarian had ruled on its applicability even though we have defeated Item 9. Now we are facing the motion to reconsider our first part under Item 13. All those in favor of such reconsideration let it be known by saying "aye"; opposed, "no." The "noes" have it and the early decision stands.

We now move to Item 53.

Gentlemen, our parliamentarian has called for a brief caucus here. Just one moment.

Mr. Swank: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Council, I think in relation to our past action, we wish to withdraw No. 53, and I move it be withdrawn.

[Proposal No. 53 (page A-23) was withdrawn without dissent.]

Transportation

President Ramer: Hearing no objection, we will move to Item 14. The Chair recognizes Professor Alan Chapman of Rice, who will speak for the Council and the Recruiting Committee.

Alan J. Chapman (Rice University): Mr. Chairman, this is Item 14, an additional recommendation of the Recruiting Committee, and I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chapman: The intent is rather clear, to prohibit paying the transportation of friends or relatives of the prospect.

I will suggest one editorial change in the last sentence, where it says "Such individual may not" it should read, "Such representative may not."

President Ramer: The Chair rules this is an editorial change and it is "Such representative may not," rather than "Such individual may not" making appropriate reference to the antecedent "representative" earlier in that statement.

[Proposal No. 14 (page A-6) was approved by voice vote.]

Entertainment

President Ramer: We move now to Item 15, relating to entertainment, and again on a proposal from the Special Recruiting Committee and endorsed by the Council.

Professor Swank will present this. He is on the stand already.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Item 15, amending Article 1, Section 5-(e).

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Swank: I think the intent of this amendment is rather clear. This amendment, as the Recruiting Committee has pointed out, is one to restrict one of the most flagrant abuses in recruiting, and it is to limit the entertainment to the institution's campus and to get rid of this mishmash of contiguous community that we have found ourselves involved in.

It is also to limit the entertainment to the student-athlete, his parents or legal guardian, and also to get rid of the entertainment of grandma and grandpa and all the other members of the family.

We feel this is an important amendment, one that will be money-saving and will make our recruiting much better. I urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 15 (page A-6) was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: We move then to Item 52, and the Chair will recognize Dwight Reed of Lincoln University who will represent the Special Recruiting Committee and the Council in presenting this to the convention.

Dwight T. Reed (Lincoln University): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of No. 52 on page 39, to amend O.I. 122 as indicated in the printed pages.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Reed: No comment is necessary. It is obvious. It increases the number of complimentary tickets from two to three.

[Proposal No. 52 (page A-23) was approved by voice vote.]

Off-Campus Visitation

President Ramer: We move now, gentlemen, to No. 16 and once again the Chair will recognize Professor Swank of the University of Oklahoma, representing the Council and the Special Recruiting Committee reporting to this convention.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): I would move the adoption of Item 16, amending Article 1, Section 5.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Swank: I really suppose before we discuss this, there are a couple of amendments. I don't know whether those should be considered before we vote on the principal matter or not. Amendment A, the Southwest Athletic Conference has proposed that.

Howard Grubbs (Southwest Athletic Conference): The Southwest Athletic Conference wishes, with the permission of the convention, to withdraw the proposed amendment to the amendment which is labeled A. However, we do wish to propose the amendment to the amendment B. May I proceed with that?

President Ramer: Yes, indeed. The Chair recognizes Commissioner Grubbs, representing the Southwest Athletic Conference, who wishes to withdraw Amendment A (page A-7) and that withdrawal will be approved, assuming the convention consents.

We are recognizing Commissioner Grubbs for the presentation of Amendment B (page A-7) as an amendment before the convention.

Mr. Grubbs: I think this is a very simple suggested change.

President Ramer: I am assuming Howard has made the motion to present this amendment. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Grubbs: This substitutes the words "twenty-four hour period" for the words "a calendar day." It changes very little the intent and

purpose of the original amendment. In our judgment if the original amendment is adopted it would appear to make it more workable.

As it stands now, if someone goes into a town to visit an athlete and arrives there sometime after lunch, in order to get his full calendar day he has to wait until midnight to start visiting. [Laughter] I recognize this amendment is in part going to be difficult to enforce, but I do think that we ought not to make it any more difficult, and he can start at six o'clock in the evening and quit the next evening at six o'clock, which makes it much more workable than midnight to midnight.

Mr. Swank: I agree with the Commissioner of the Southwest Conference, if we are going to adopt this Bylaw amendment we should make it as simple as possible, but unfortunately I disagree with the Southwest Conference's belief, and feel the 24-hour rule would make it totally impossible to enforce adequately. You would have arguments from coaches coming in, "I got there at 3:51." "No, you didn't, you got there at 3:52 and you violated."

I think the calendar day date is easier to enforce, if we are going to have this type of amendment. I urge you to defeat Amendment B.

President Ramer: Is there further discussion? You are voting on Amendment B (page A-7). All in favor -- I am sorry. I was premature.

Mr. Grubbs: I might add that the same argument would apply if you start at 11:51 or 12:01 at night. [Laughter]

President Ramer: Thank you, Howard. Is there further discussion? All right, gentlemen, we are facing proposed Amendment B.

[Amendment B to Proposal No. 16 (pages A-7-8) was defeated by hand vote.]

Charles Oldfather (Big Eight Conference): Mr. Chairman, the withdrawal of Amendment A went by us or me at least pretty quickly, because the Big Eight had intended to put in an amendment to this, eliminating from No. 16 the representative of the athletic interests clause, and when we were informed that Amendment A would come before the floor there was no reason for our putting in a separate amendment, and we were willing to accept it.

What I am doing now I guess is objecting to the withdrawal and asking that it be voted on.

President Ramer: Thank you, Professor Oldfather. The Chair recognizes your objection and rules that we should return immediately to the consideration of Amendment A. Do you move the approval of this?

Mr. Oldfather: I do, sir.

President Ramer: Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

The motion has been seconded to approve Amendment A, and it is open for discussion.

Mr. Oldfather: If I may speak to this, we feel this is another one of those dangers which is absolutely uncontrollable, and as was said a few moments ago in connection with another proposal, we might get clobbered without knowing we were being clobbered, because I don't think there is any way a coach coming into an area can be aware of whether or not some particular representative of athletic interests has happened to visit that young man in his community.

It is stated that somehow this uncontrollable thing has to be kept

track of, which is impossible. That is the reason we suggest that "representative" be taken out of No. 16.

President Ramer: Thank you, Professor Oldfather. Is there further discussion?

Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas): I would like to say first that I am against the two-visit rule—even though the Southwest Conference is for it. I will give my reason for it when the two-visit rule comes up to vote. But I would say we have to keep in the representative interests if we approve the two-visit rule. We went through it with this rule four or five years, Mr. Chairman, and we found we would use up our two visits, in the last two weeks of the recruiting when it came down to the boy making his decision, yes or no, turn the matter over to the alumni; the alumni would be in the house, talking to the boy, and I would be on the outside, waiting for the alumni to come out . . . then I would send the alumni back in, and I wasn't quite sure what he would think. [Laughter] I would get clobbered, really get clobbered, because the alumni are businessmen and know no other way except to get the job done, and don't know this book of rules . . . I have to carry it with me to recruit.

So if we don't know it how can the alumni know all the rules? As a football coach, I want to take the alumni out of recruiting, and this will put them back in recruiting. When the decision is reached by the boy's family, the alumni will be there, helping them make this decision.

President Ramer: Thank you, Coach Broyles.

Mr. Oldfather: Mr. Chairman, if I may speak briefly, I think nobody suggests we put them back in. The problem is, how is the coach going to know, because of the rather broad definition of who represents your interests, how is he going to know whether somebody has visited him at this particular time.

President Ramer: Thank you, Professor Oldfather.

Mr. Broyles: Mr. Chairman, as a football coach, I would like to say that we know most of the time who is speaking to our athletes. What I am concerned about is when the boy is making his decision. We feel that we should keep the alumni out of it. As a football coach, I doubt that anybody is working in Arkansas that I don't know about.

President Ramer: Thank you, Coach Broyles. Is there further discussion?

[Amendment A to Proposal No. 16 (page A-7) was defeated by hand vote.]

President Ramer: Gentlemen, we have yet another amendment to consider on this, and the Chair will ask Professor Swank to come to the microphone to present this to the convention.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): I refer you to your green pages now. If you will look at Amendment Q, which is an amendment to Proposal No. 16, I would move the adoption of Amendment Q. (pages A-36 and A-37).

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Swank: Briefly, let me give our intent. It is quite clear. The language change is in their home community or in his home community to "any location other than the institution's campus." What this does is make the two-visit rule, if that is to be passed or is passed later on, apply to any place off campus.

Some have said, "Well, if you have it as presently stated, the two visits in the home community, all you have to do is take him six miles down the road and have him stop in to see you there, and it doesn't apply." So it makes it easier to enforce, any time off the campus the two-visit rule would apply.

Robert Ray (University of Iowa): I would like to ask a question with regard to this to which some member of the committee can respond. If I understand this legislation, is it a fact that if a representative of the athletic interests of an institution for recruiting purposes calls upon a boy on two occasions that then an employee of the institution may not thereafter talk to that boy? Is that correct?

Mr. Swank: Bob, as I understand the intent of this legislation it would be correct. It is a two-visit rule. You can invite the young man to come to the campus, but there would be no further visits off the campus.

Mr. Ray: If he is once identified as a representative of the institution he retains that identity, or that has been our assumption, and I think we even have legislation to nail that down even further. If he is identified as a representative of the athletic interests of the institution he retains that identity. Is that correct?

Mr. Swank: Yes.

Mr. Ray: So if a person has represented the institution in recruitment of Athlete A and is involved in one year, on another occasion, even though casually, an occasion may arise in connection with another Athlete B, that constitutes one visitation and reduces in turn the number of possible calls by the coaching staff to one. If in fact this applies to the paid representative of the institution, a coaching staff member may not contact that boy at all. Is that correct?

Mr. Swank: It is a little difficult to answer that completely until that other matter voted on later on in the day is decided. But, Bob, I think you are discussing the principal matter now rather than the amendment of changing this from the home community to any location other than the institution's campus.

Mr. Ray: I think what I say is germane because the question of a casual nature of a person's contact with the prospective athlete who may in the past have been identified as a representative of the athletic interests does bear on this location question. If he elects not to do this in the boy's home community but does so elsewhere, what is the effect?

Mr. Swank: It would be a visit, Bob. Of course, I would have to refer to what Coach Broyles said—he knows everybody in Arkansas and is talking for Arkansas. Maybe all the other coaches do, too.

Mr. Ray: I think that is a very large assumption.

[Amendment Q (page A-36) to Proposal No. 16 (page A-7) was approved by hand vote.]

President Ramer: All in favor of the main motion as amended please signify your affirmative response.

Edwin Crowder (University of Colorado): May we not discuss the main motion now?

President Ramer: Yes, Coach Crowder. I am sorry.

Mr. Crowder: I would speak to this main motion by saying briefly that in my time in athletics I have been greatly interested and involved in recruiting. I have talked at great length with men from

various other conferences who have had this rule from time to time. They have disposed of the rule because it is totally impractical. It is a rule which says you may visit—we now have an amendment to say you may make contact, either yourself as a coach or some unknown interest perhaps only twice off your own campus. If you do that, gentlemen, you are going to put the strength of recruiting power in the hands of a few schools who are already immensely powerful. Those schools may quickly see the guy a couple of times and they have the impact of gaining that recruiting advantage.

The vast number of us here do not succeed in recruiting by hustle. If we pass a rule so impractical that the history of its performance is that it has been thrown out as the institutions couldn't afford it, and now turn around and say that the coaches may not work hard and try to equalize some school which has a greater advantage, I think we are taking from the intercollegiate athletic teams their right to exist.

Alan J. Chapman (Rice University): This rule was not abandoned because it didn't work.

Edwin Cady (Indiana University): I think it is rather interesting that there has been opposition to this amendment from universities for quite different reasons than those cited by Coach Broyles.

In the Big Ten I should say one of the things we are most concerned about is to have the student-athlete coming into our institution who wants to come to our institution; that is to say, at Indiana we want somebody who wants to come to Indiana University, not just because we want him and we need him, but because he wants to come to our university and to be part of the extended university family.

Very often I think we arrive at that decision with him because he knows Indiana people, because he knows the people in his town, people whom he respects, people with whom he has normal contact, Indiana people or Purdue people or Michigan people or Ohio State people, whatever it is. I won't call them all.

We don't want the alumni out of the picture. We don't want the alumni out of recruiting. We want the alumni very deep in this sort of thing, precisely because they are the product of the university, they are a fundamental part of the university family.

I will give you a perfect example of this. We had a boy from Bloomington deciding not long ago, a couple of years ago, whether he wanted to come to us or go to a Class A institution. He was issued a tender. He was in the silent period, and his mother asked very earnestly—she very earnestly wanted him to come to Indiana—"Is it all right if I talk to Charlie at breakfast?" [Laughter]

I think we have begun to get into something that we just can't handle.

Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas): Mr. Chairman, I would agree with Dr. Cady. We would like them to say what a fine school we have and I would like to be there most of the time when they say that. What I was referring to was the fact that the alumnus was there when we are trying to get a "no" or a "yes" out of the prospect. That is the danger when you have used up your visits. I want the alumni to present Arkansas as a good institution and the fact that the boy will have a good future there. That is one of the reasons I think the

rule is so impractical.

Let me mention two or three others. We found in the Southwest Conference as coaches when we had this rule we had more mistrust and more suspicion than with any other rule or any group of rules we have ever had. We were always taking up the phone and calling another coach and saying, "Well, I know you were over there on January 3 and January 8, and I heard your assistant coach was there." Then the other coach would come back and say, "I bumped into him." [Laughter] He didn't really mean to see him, but he was in the coach's office and the boy walked in. What are you going to do, turn around and run out? Or if you are in the hallway of the student's institution and the prospect walks by, when you have already had two visits, when he sees you are there and he in turn says, "This school is definitely interested in me because they were here before."

The two-visit rule did not cut down the Arkansas travel budget. It created just the opposite result in this fashion: We felt we could not in two visits really understand the boy enough to know whether he was interested enough in Arkansas so we could stop visiting the boy located around the University of Arkansas campus. As it is today, we recruit basically Arkansas boys and boys in nearby areas. We know these boys have an interest in Arkansas. We can concentrate on a particular position because of the key that we have, where with the two-visit rule we could not do this, so what we do is go out into other areas and put out posters after they have visited once or even twice, and we didn't have any idea what the boy was going to do. We broadened out and went into Illinois, Chicago, and everywhere else, trying to find other prospects, not knowing who was going to attend the University of Arkansas. It increased our travel burden rather than decreased it.

Another thing it brought out was that we as coaches cannot tell to whom we want to offer a scholarship on the first visit. We go out as coaches, Mr. Chairman, and we are looking for prospects. He looks at the boy and comes back to report to the head coach what he has seen. When he has reported back we take all the coaches there and we prophesy which boy we are going to offer a scholarship to. I don't think we could waste a visit—we couldn't in these days—to the boy to look at him. We have to look at him, and then judge whether we can offer a scholarship. It is a bad situation when you have to offer a scholarship before you even see the boy.

The signing thing enters into this, too. I believe the interpretation I have from the committee is that we go back to sign the boy on February 8, after just one visit. If we have used our two visits, do we have to mail it to him and hope he signs it and sends it back? I would like an interpretation on that.

Mr. Swank: Mr. President, I think we should ask the chairman of the Committee on Recruiting to answer that question.

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference): Frank, if I understand or interpret your question, suppose he signs a conference letter of intent with you?

Mr. Broyles: No. I am asking if you have to use one of your two visits to go to sign him on signing day. You would get one visit and then you would hope to get him to sign on the signing date.

Mr. James: If he signs, subsequent to that signing date you can use

one visit to validate it.

Mr. Broyles: If you have used your two visits you could not go to him for signing?

Mr. James: Well, it would not necessarily apply if he had applied to your institution for admission. If you have on file any indication of his declaration of his intention to enroll at the institution, this does not require a letter of intent to comply with that provision.

Mr. Broyles: Bob, what I am asking here—you could not have enough coaches to be in the motel of a good prospect to use your second bid the day before signing.

Mr. James: I recognize what you are saying.

Mr. Broyles: In conclusion, I would say the Southwest Conference, the coaches at least, did not feel we voted to ask this rule to be removed because we wanted an out, but we took a vote on this in December, and the coaches there or their representatives voted to oppose this rule.

Ernest McCoy (University of Miami): Mr. Chairman, as a change of pace for this discussion, knowing it is a rather worn subject, in the last sentence of this paragraph I think there is a very important part of the legislation that, if passed, has the impact of really helping the other.

I wonder if it would not be well again to divide this paragraph into two parts, so that if the first part is defeated the second part would state that, "On any visits described in this paragraph, neither the staff member (nor any representative of the institution) may expend any funds other than necessary for his own personal expenses."

I think that is an important part of this and should be considered.

President Ramer: Ernie, where does the second paragraph begin, so we may understand it?

Mr. McCoy: On the third to the last line in the paragraph—"On any visit described in this paragraph—"

President Ramer: That is, "On any visit described in this paragraph," the second proposed visit should occur. I am entertaining now from Mr. McCoy a motion to divide this matter. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded, and the motion to divide Proposal No. 16 (page A-7) was approved by voice vote.]

Tonto Coleman (Southeastern Conference): Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. McCoy's point is well taken, and when you put "On any visit described in this paragraph" actually we should say "On any visit." Is that correct?

Mr. McCoy: My first statement was that and then I read what is in there, and I mean exactly what you say.

Mr. Coleman: Yes, I think what Ernie means is to agree that the implication was, "On any visits neither the staff member (nor any representative of the institution) may expend any funds other than necessary for his own personal expenses."

Seaver Peters (Dartmouth College): Mr. President, somebody suggested that conventions or proposals at conventions promote strange bedfellows and the Big Eight and the Southwest Conference seem to go along with the Ivy group, at least as far as Dartmouth College.

A number of us in the Ivy group have national enrollment committees, a group of alumni who voluntarily conduct an enrollment effort to seek for our institutions the outstanding young men in the

country. It is a voluntary national effort.

This proposal, in my opinion, is another case of an athletic organization dictating academic enrollment policies.

President Ramer: Thank you, Mr. Peters. Gentlemen, is there further discussion? We are voting on the first portion of this now. All of the amendment except the last three lines, as indicated in the division by Mr. McCoy.

[The first portion of Proposal No. 16 (page A-7) was defeated by hand vote.]

President Ramer: We are now facing the second aspect of this. "On any visits described in this paragraph, neither the staff member (nor any representative of the institution) may expend any funds other than necessary for his own personal expenses."

It is open for discussion.

Earle Edwards (An Officer of the National Football Coaches Association): Our people were highly in favor of this proposal.

[The second portion of Item 16 (page A-7) was approved by hand vote.]

[The convention recessed at 12:20 p.m.]

BUSINESS SESSION

Saturday Afternoon, January 8, 1972

The session convened at 1:45 p.m., President Ramer presiding.

President Ramer: Gentlemen, we are grateful for your good attendance at this afternoon portion of our business session.

I am pleased to report that the hotel representatives have agreed to extend the checkout hour until the close of this convention, the adjournment time this afternoon. This means one thing clearly, that the problem of the checkout time will not be authorization for your leaving before five o'clock. You are supposed to smile when I make a statement like that.

Seriously, please bear with us as the afternoon moves on, and in spite of almost certain tedious phases of our deliberations we would be grateful to you, and difficult as some of these matters may be, together we are facing problems that are of importance to our Association. I know that you agree with me that they merit our serious attention and the attention of as large a number of our representatives as possible.

Representative of Athletic Interests

We are coming on our agenda to the final proposal classified under the Recruiting category, namely Item No. 49. Once again I would like to call Commissioner James, who is chairman of the Special Recruiting Committee, to present this for our consideration on the floor.

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference): Mr. President, I recommend the adoption to O.I. 101 of the Bylaws, as it appears in No. 49, (page A-22).

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. James: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the adoption of Amendment O (pages A 36-37) to proposal No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

John W. Harbaugh (Pacific Coast Conference and Stanford University): The rationale of the three words, "it is presumed" is to soften the severity of the statement as it stands originally. It seems unwise to brand for life an athletic representative. For example, he might change institutions. Therefore, his affiliation in the former institution as an athletic representative is terminated.

Therefore, we feel the introduction of these three words, "it is presumed" will eliminate that difficulty.

[Amendment O (page A-36) to Proposal No. 49 (page A-22) was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: Item No 49 is now before us as amended. Is there further discussion?

[Proposal No. 49 (page A-22) as amended, was approved by voice vote.]

Representative Schedule

President Ramer: Gentlemen, we move to No. 10. The Chair recognizes Howard Gentry, Director of Athletics at Tennessee State, to present this before the conference.

Howard C. Gentry (Tennessee State University): Mr. Chairman, I move to amend Article 4, Section 2-(d) as found in Item 10 (page A-5).

[The motion was seconded.]

Wilfred Crowley (West Coast Athletic Conference): Mr. Chairman, we have an amendment to the amendment, which is found in Amendment D. It is a very simple one. As it reads:

"To sponsor and conduct a representative schedule in a minimum of four intercollegiate sports, according to the level of intercollegiate competition of a conference or an individual institution, with at least one sport in every sport season."

We read this in our conference and we did not know the intent. I understand the intent of this legislation is to prevent certain institutions from having the same sport in several different seasons or two different seasons. I don't think it does that.

What we had in mind is certain conferences or certain schools are struggling to retain a football program and the word "representative" is quite relative. There are certain schools who operate their football program in the fall on the club level. They may schedule eight games, possibly two of those games with certain teams. So this is just to clarify the word "representative" and we would like to have it amended to that effect.

[The motion was seconded and Amendment D (page A-33) to Proposal No. 10 (page A-5) was approved by voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 10 (page A-5), as amended, was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: We will move to Item 48, and the Chair recognizes Howard Gentry once again to present this for the Council.

Howard C. Gentry (Tennessee State University): Mr. Chairman, I move the proposal to add a new O.I. 17, as is found in Item No. 48.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Gentry: We would like to make an editorial change by changing the last word on line 2 from "it" to "its" and add the word "team" making O.I. 17 read as follows:

"If an institution sponsors the same sport in two different seasons, it may count the sport only in the season in which its team participates in the most contests."

President Ramer: The Chair rules this is an editorial change. Is there discussion?

[Proposal No. 48 (with stated editorial change) (page A-22) was approved by voice vote.]

Membership Classes

President Ramer: Gentlemen, we move to consideration of No. 11, a proposed constitutional change, the intent being to qualify institutions which offer two years of upper level collegiate work in active membership. The Chair recognizes Lou Myers, representing the Council, to put it before this Convention.

Louis A. Myers (University of Arizona): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 11, which amends Article 4, Section 3-(a) of the Constitution.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Myers: The intent of this amendment is to qualify institutions that offer three years of upper level collegiate work for active mem-

bership in the Association. There is an increasing number of such institutions, and the Council believes it is in the best interests of the Association to provide for their active membership.

[Proposal No. 11 (page A-5) was approved by voice vote.]

Postseason Football Contests

President Ramer: Gentlemen, we move now to Item 17. The Chair recognizes Professor Burry of Westminster.

Harold Burry (Westminster College): Mr. Chairman, I move the approval of the amendment to Article 2, Section 2, by adding a new paragraph (o), as stated in No. 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Burry: Mr. Chairman, there are I believe 166 institutions that have dual membership. I am sure they are all in the same dilemma as we are. To my knowledge there is no legislation presently that prohibits teams from playing in sports other than football, and this is the sole purpose of this proposal.

Richard Koenig (Valparaiso University): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Council I urge a vote against this proposal for three reasons.

No. 1. I believe it is premature. At the request of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, the Officers and Council appointed a committee which consists of Past President Plant, Secretary-Treasurer Barnes and myself, to meet with the NAIA and discuss this problem along with others for the benefit of the membership. There are rules in that organization which work against the dual members.

We happen to think that this proposal is premature. It is being considered right now. As a matter of fact, your committee is awaiting a report from the NAIA.

The second reason I am asking you to vote against this is I think it is incomplete. It only touches on one phase of the problem.

Prior to the establishment of national competition the NCAA appointed an Extra Events Committee to assure that postseason competition would be conducted in the best interests of member schools. This particular proposal would remove postseason competition in football from under the regulation of this committee. So I think it is incomplete.

My last reason is I think it is inconsistent. It seems rather strange to me we should grant exceptions to those members who have dual membership. We are not opposed to dual membership. If a given school wants to join both organizations, that is its privilege, but we do think that if it belongs to both organizations it should agree to abide by the structure of the stricter of the two rules.

The net effect of this proposal, if it is passed, would be to give an advantage to dual members which those who belong only to the NCAA will not have.

Gentlemen, for those three reasons I urge that you vote against this proposal.

Wade R. Stinson (University of Kansas): Mr. Chairman, I speak in behalf of the Extra Events Committee. We urge you to defeat this proposed amendment.

C. D. Henry (Grambling College): I want to ask a question. I am asking for information because with the records we won't get to play in either game anyway. [Laughter] I notice in the green book on page

93, that on May 6, when this meeting Mr. Koenig refers to was held, in the report that was passed out it said the Association should take steps to work out a solution with the NAIA.

My question is: The material that he said he was working on, does this mean he has something to present to the Extra Events Committee to try to solve this dilemma about dual members?

Mr. Koenig: I am not too sure I understand everything he is asking, but I did say in my comments that we are very definitely considering this proposal and a proposal similar to this, but we are also awaiting a report from the other part of our committee, and you may be interested to know that the president, not our committee but the NAIA Committee, the president of Northwestern State in Louisiana, Arnold Kilpatrick, is a member of that committee; Eddie Robinson of Grambling is a member of that committee, and Ted Werner of the University of California at Riverside.

To answer specifically your question, we are considering this question along with a lot of others.

[Proposal No. 17 (page A-8) was defeated by voice vote.]

College All-Star Contests

President Ramer: Gentlemen, we move to two items concerning College All-Star Games. The first is No. 18, and we ask Bill Ketz, representing the Council, to present this matter.

Wilford H. Ketz (Union College): Mr. Chairman, I move that No. 18, Bylaws Amendment to Article 2, Section 3, by deleting paragraph (b), be approved.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Ketz: This simply gives flexibility to an institution to decide whether or not their football team should play outside of the vacation period, and we think this is quite desirable.

[Proposal No. 18 (page A-8) was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: We will move next to No. 43, which is a proposed amendment to the Constitution, and we will ask our Secretary-Treasurer Barnes to present this for our consideration.

Samuel E. Barnes (District of Columbia Teachers College): I move that we amend the Constitution, O.I. 3.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 43 (page A-20) was approved by voice vote.]

Basketball Playing Season

President Ramer: We move now to three items relating to the Basketball Playing Season, beginning with No. 19.

Thomas Niland (LeMoyne College-Syracuse): I have been asked to speak on behalf of this amendment as Coach Wall of MacMurray College has departed inasmuch as his team is playing tonight. I move the adoption of Item 19, amending Article 3, Section 1 of the Bylaws.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Niland: The purpose of the amendment is to provide that the permissible playing season in basketball may start on a weekend rather than the arbitrary date of December 1. The survey indicated the majority of the college basketball games are played on the weekend, and this will provide for additional weekends for the basketball season. It really doesn't extend the season that much, but it makes it more convenient to start on the last weekend in November rather

than perhaps in the middle of the week, because December 1 may fall on that particular date.

Edward W. Malan (Pomona College): I would like to speak in favor of this motion, because I think we are entering into a difficult calendar period with a longer break before Christmas and the coach wants to get the team ready to play now from December 1 to 16, and you go into a jam. So that would give you a chance to play the last week in November, and I think it would make it a little better arrangement for the teams themselves.

[Proposal No. 19 (pages A-8 and A-9) was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: We move next to Item 20. Is there someone from the ECAC to present this matter?

William Dioguardi (Montclair State College): Representing the ECAC Council, I move the approval of Item 20 to amend Bylaw Article 3, Section 1-(b).

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Dioguardi: I would like to speak on behalf of this by saying, first of all, it is strictly a permissive type of legislation with a great deal of flexibility and the amendment would give permission to those institutions who wish to play 26 games and also permit two outside scrimmages. This would give the coaches and the players the opportunity to prepare for the intercollegiate season and still meet a schedule of 26 games.

I hope that everyone is looking at this as offering those who wish to compete in 26 the opportunity to do so, and not that there is a requirement that you must compete in 26 games. Thank you.

John A. Fuzak (Michigan State University): I am speaking in behalf of the Council in opposing this proposal. Even though it appears that the season is not being exceeded, I think it is fairly obvious that the members would look at it as an extension of the season. Those who wish to have two scrimmages must now have them counted, and it therefore limits the season to 24 games. With this adoption they would have two scrimmages and 26 games.

It seems to me with the earlier starting season it is possible to play a sufficient number of games. The students are missing a good many classes and the basketball season is a very long one.

I would like to urge you in behalf of the Council to defeat this proposal.

[Proposal No. 20 (page A-9) was defeated by standing vote 208-86.]

Postseason Basketball Tournaments

President Ramer: We proceed now to a consideration of Item 57. The Chair will recognize Bob Pritchard, representing the Council, to present this to the convention floor.

Robert W. Pritchard (Worcester Polytechnic Institute): Mr. Chairman, I move that O.I. 307 be clarified.

[The motion was seconded. Proposal No. 57 (page A-24) was approved by voice vote.]

Individual Eligibility

President Ramer: We move now to three matters of Individual Eligibility. First, Item No. 21. The Chair recognizes Ernie Casale, representing the Council, who will present this for our consideration.

Ernest C. Casale (Temple University): Mr. Chairman, I move the

adoption of Proposal No. 21.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Casale: Nothing other than it is just a clarification of terms, that the institution is responsible for certifying the eligibility of all its athletes in NCAA events.

[Proposal No. 21 (page A-9) was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: We move to Item 22. Again this will be presented by Ernie Casale.

Mr. Casale: Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 22.

[The motion was seconded. Proposal No. 22 (page A-10) was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: No. 23 follows, presented by Ernie Casale.

Mr. Casale: Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 23.

[The motion was seconded. Proposal No. 23 (page A-10) was approved by voice vote.]

Freshman Rule

President Ramer: We move now, gentlemen, to the famous item No. 24. Who will present the motion?

Alan Williams (University of Virginia): Presenting Item No. 24 for adoption, in behalf of the Atlantic Coast Conference, the Western Athletic Conference and Hofstra University, I so move.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Williams: This is an item which has been before the convention for the past several years. We have had very successful experiences in permitting freshmen to compete in sports other than football. I call your attention that last year this motion was narrowly defeated and the Athletic Directors, at their summer session, overwhelmingly approved the request that freshmen be allowed to play in football and basketball.

In behalf of our conference we think this is a good move and will give the young men an opportunity to compete and compete successfully.

Stanley J. Marshall (South Dakota State University): The College Division Committee unanimously requests that the College Division delegates do not vote on this matter. It is not directly pertaining to us, only indirectly, and therefore we make that request.

Charles Oldfather (Big Eight Conference): Mr. Chairman, I hope this will not have the effect it did the last time I moved to divide. I think the reason for moving to divide this is rather simple. I move to divide into the question of freshmen participating in basketball and the question of participation in football, with the participation in basketball to be considered first.

President Ramer: Thank you, Professor Oldfather. Gentlemen, our parliamentarian has ruled that the Chair may act on this, if there is no objection from the floor, and I will rule momentarily that the suggestion for a division is appropriate, unless I hear objection from the floor.

While we are waiting for Professor Oldfather to speak further in regard to that division, let me make one statement, under which I am in some command from the Council. You will recall the explanation of the so-called "conscience rule" earlier. On the point to which Stan Marshall spoke just a moment ago, the Council suggests that you think about this so-called appealing to conscience as you cast your

vote on this particular amendment.

Professor Oldfather: do you want to comment further on the appropriate division of this?

Mr. Oldfather: Mr. Chairman, on the assumption you have ruled that the division is appropriate, I would like to move, on behalf of the Big Eight Conference, approval of the division that I suggested, the first one that the freshmen be permitted to participate in basketball.

President Ramer: The division calls for attention first to basketball, and I am assuming a motion to that effect is before the house. Is there a second.

[The motion was seconded.]

John A. Fuzak (Michigan State University): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in opposition to approval of either sport. It strikes me that we hear a good deal about the financial problems of intercollegiate athletics, and I suspect the motivation here, coming from this source, making freshmen eligible to compete in football and basketball.

I submit our problems in large universities may be quite different than those in smaller universities. One of the things we must face is that we are quickly becoming more and more selective in our participation. We are discouraging through our practice the walkout. In spite of our many efforts, I think the record is fairly clear that where we have approved varsity competition for freshmen, the freshmen teams are gone.

We attempted in several conferences to hold and not have freshmen compete, but what happened was we could not do it because of the competition in terms of recruiting. We just could not hold it.

So to say you are able to keep your own rule on this is not very realistic. I think we have to face our constituencies and the attitudes of our students and our faculty, and if we become more and more specialized; that is the recruited, aided athlete as our performer in the larger universities, I think our program, particularly in football and basketball, is in jeopardy.

President Ramer: Thank you, Professor Fuzak. Is there further discussion?

William Davis (Texas Tech University): Mr. Chairman, I understand perfectly well that the convention was at a disadvantage this morning because I lost my voice [laughter] but I feel compelled at this time to whisper into the microphone and Mr. Fuzak really made my statement, but I want to second it.

I think philosophically, from the viewpoint of the university people, from the viewpoint of our educational ideals and our academic standards and all this, we cannot support this. I would like to ask, Mr. President, that we vote against this amendment.

Richard P. Koenig (Valparaiso University): Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Council and as a College Division member of the Council, I would like to support the plea which was made by the College Committee. Those of us in the College Division have freshmen eligible, but let the University Division people decide this question. I urge, and I recognize you have a right to vote if you are in the College Division, but I urge those of you who are not affected by this to remain seated.

J. D. Morgan (University of California, Los Angeles): I would like to support Professor Fuzak and Professor Davis' position on this, but

I would like also to point out we are relating this specifically to basketball, and at the present time I think the pressures of five continuous months of practice and play on the major college level are too much pressure from the standpoint of the freshman athlete participating on the varsity level.

Roy A. Larmee (Big Ten Conference): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Big Ten I also would like to go on record for our conference in opposition to this for either football or basketball for the reasons that have already been enumerated.

Rev. Wilfred Crowley (West Coast Athletic Conference): The West Coast Athletic Conference would also like to go on record as being opposed to this, and for the reasons that have been very well stated.

Thomas J. Frericks (University of Dayton): I would like to present a different viewpoint here that pertains particularly to our situation, and I am sure we have some others who share a like position.

The University of Dayton is listed in the major institutions competing in football. It has played in that classification for some time now, but it becomes exceedingly difficult with the increased cost of going to school with the tuition rise for us to be able to continue to offset the cost through raising prices and things of that nature.

I would like to relate a specific instance. In our institution seven years ago 74 grants cost us about \$96,000. Today they cost us \$210,000. We have not been able to offset this increase just through the normal type of things you do from year to year to try to increase your revenue.

We heartily support this. We think each institution across the country has the latitude to do what it wants to do in its individual situation. We do not share in any television revenues. We have tried to get a regional television appearance but it has been very fruitless for us.

As a result, I ask the membership to consider seriously giving us and some of the other schools I know laboring under the same situation the ability to play freshmen. We think it will be a cost-saving measure in our scholarship program up to \$50,000 or \$60,000.

A. A. White (University of Houston): I would like to speak in support of the motion.

If from the educational point of view it is educationally unsound for freshmen to play in the University Division, it is educationally unsound for them to play in the College Division. I don't think it is educationally unsound, so I am not speaking against it in the College Division, but no one suggests any reason to me as to why the two are any different in the educational posture.

I don't think it is educationally unsound because actually the young man who comes to us now from the high school is more sophisticated on the whole, much better educated. They make the transition without any great trauma and I don't think there is any problem in making the transition. Actually the freshman himself spends a lot of time in the freshman role and it wouldn't be a great deal more, I think, if they participated at the university level.

There isn't any question but it would mean a very substantial saving feature, and for that reason I am wholly for it.

Jesse Hill (Pacific Coast Athletic Conference): Having worn one hat for many years, I would like to speak in favor of this. I am now commissioner of a conference that is facing many problems financially.

I think consideration has to be given to some of the schools that do not have financial resources that others do as far as financial aid is concerned.

I really don't see a great deal of difference in allowing a boy to compete on a varsity basketball team than I do in allowing a boy to compete as a freshman in baseball for a five and a half month season. I don't see the pressures involved because he doesn't start practice until the middle of October. He has had an opportunity to become oriented around the campus, and I would urge your consideration to this with a favorable vote.

Philip Theibert (Hofstra University): We would be affected by only half of this. We used freshmen this past season in football and found it very successful. We saved about half the budget we had previously. In looking at it and talking to some of the people in the College Division, we think we can do it in basketball and still play on the same level we have been playing on. I would like to endorse it wholeheartedly.

[Proposal No. 24 (page A-10), as it applies to the sport of basketball, was approved by hand vote.]

President Ramer: Gentlemen, I am assuming with the division of the motion that we now face the question of the applicability of Item 24 to the sport of football.

Charles Oldfather (Big Eight Conference): Mr. Chairman, I merely rise to suggest that as I understand the Constitution, I believe we have a number of members of the University Division who do not compete in football, and I think it would be appropriate to ask the Chair that they abstain from that vote.

President Ramer: Thank you for the suggestion. I think the Council's suggestion applies to this vote with respect to football as with basketball. Is there a second to the motion to extend this applicability to football?

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 24 (page A-10) as it applies to the sport of football was approved 94-67.]

1.600 Rule

President Ramer: Gentlemen, let us be in order please. As indicated earlier, I suggested that the Chair might suggest still some change in the order of sequence among these items.

You may have noted that items 25, 26, 27 and 58 under Transfer Rule deal in close fashion with the 1.600 consideration. I would like to suggest, therefore, that we present the 1.600 Rule item, shown on the top of your white page, in the position on the agenda just preceding the Transfer Rule, and we will proceed on that basis if there is no objection from the floor.

There being no objection then, I suggest that we move to Item 32. Is there a representative from Queens College to present this amendment?

Robert J. Tierney (Queens College): I move the adoption of Amendment 32.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Tierney: We propose this legislation be abolished for the following reasons:

No. 1. It is discriminatory. Some schools, particularly those with

special programs, cannot possibly conform to this legislation. Others find it difficult to do so. In varying degrees, therefore, it unfairly penalizes most student-athletes in that institution.

No. 2. The legislation violates institutional autonomy. I don't think I need to embellish on that point at this time.

No. 3. There is serious question as to the validity of the type of tests that are used to project a 1.600 index.

Lastly, I feel that we should abolish this legislation now before someone on the outside perhaps may do it for us and perhaps through a lawsuit.

I would hope you would support the abolishment of this legislation. Thank you.

Alan Chapman (Rice University): I would like to speak in behalf of the Council in urging the convention to oppose this resolution. This is one of the few pieces of legislation we have on the books that does try to protect the student-athlete from exploitation for athletic purposes.

There is no question as to the discriminatory practices of the examinations in question, although in the last year it has been indicated that although discriminatory in an absolute sense the formula we are using does predict for a student-athlete.

I urge the convention to retain this rule, both in behalf of the Council and the Committee.

Robert M. Behrman (City College of New York): I would like to beg the indulgence of the convention for a brief moment to listen to a hastily scribbled statement.

In 1951 my institution, the City College of New York, caught up in the frantic pace of big time, big pressure, big money basketball, became involved in a scandal which shook the world of intercollegiate athletics to its roots. To this day, more than twenty years later, we in athletics at the City College of New York still live with the specter of that scandal hovering over us, and that policy dictates that never again shall we go big time.

There have been certain questions which have accrued, however, for to become in every sense an academic discipline there are no scholarships or grants-in-aid for student-athletes. In fact, there are no student-athletes per se, because our administrative policy is that a student's matriculation may not be solicited by a member of the athletic staff with a view toward the student's ultimate participation in the athletic program. Our staff may not make contact with New York City high school students with an eye toward recruitment. Students who do participate receive absolutely nothing in the terms of preferential treatment, not even early registration to enable the student to come out to practice.

Despite all of this, I believe we offer a wholesome program which has become an integral part of the general education of our student body.

Now we are confronted by a piece of legislation which albeit well intended, threatens to damage our program in terms of affecting the vitality and enthusiasm of our student body.

Because we cannot subscribe to a 1.600 legislation, we have a special administrative policy that has been mandated by our city and our state, we are deemed ineligible for national championship events.

Each year we have traditionally sent three members of our fencing team to the NCAA championship events. Last year we were unable to do so, and three students, exemplary in terms of both academic ability and athletic ability, were denied the right to participate.

It certainly seems to me there is a great injustice here, if we consider ourselves to be student-oriented educators.

This is more I hope than a selfish plea for three students. It is a plea for many thousands of students across the nation who have been admitted to college under modern, viable, educationally sound programs which have taken into consideration the sociological and economic changes within our society. If our institutions are worth their salt in terms of our administration, let them develop, supervise, and regulate this particular phase of academic eligibility.

The very tests used in predicting academic success have been proven invalid to a great degree. Let us not shut out a great segment of today's population who might stand to profit through athletics.

In conclusion, I respectfully suggest that approval of this proposed amendment will not provide a black eye for intercollegiate athletics but a laurel instead. [Applause.]

Alan Chapman (Rice University): I would just like to point out that under the present application of the rules, the student is not recruited athletically under the rather broad O.I. 100; if he is not recruited under that O.I., when he gets into school this rule does not apply. The purpose of the rule is to keep from recruiting these boys for their athletic power only.

Michael Fleischer (Herbert H. Lehman College): Notwithstanding that statement, that still precludes a freshman coming into college and participating in athletics. He has to prove himself under the 1.600 rule. That is why we are asking for a favorable vote on the amendment.

John Larsen (University of Southern California): I am speaking in opposition to Proposal No. 32. I urge the convention members to consider in their action just taken in making freshmen eligible for both basketball and football, that action makes it more urgent than ever that we have some measure of the prospective student-athlete's ability to succeed at the university level, which is presently provided by the 1.600 rule. So I think that each of you should consider that. If you had a different attitude or position on Proposal 32 prior to the action previously taken, you might reconsider that position.

Hubert Heitman (University of California, Davis): I would like to speak in favor of the amendment. We talk about a vote of conscience, and in past years we have recruited athletes who have not been eligible. We know this. The one point goes back to policing the institution. They have this rule in the state of California. We have students who come to school who have all the things we say they do, all the good things we talk about, and they come to school and they cannot participate.

I am in favor of supporting this amendment and voting out the 1.600 rule.

President Ramer: Is there other discussion?

[Proposal No. 32 (page A-14) was defeated 186-125.]

President Ramer: We move now to Item No. 31, and the Chair recognizes **Dean Boyd McWhorter**, who will speak for the Council

on this particular item.

H. Boyd McWhorter (University of Georgia): Mr. Chairman, I move the proposed amendment of Article 4, Section 3, of the Bylaws, which adds a new paragraph (e), Amendment 31.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 31 (pages A-13-14) was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: We face now Item No. 33. The Chair recognizes Professor Chapman who will present this to the convention.

Alan Chapman (Rice University): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 33.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chapman: Item No. 33 merely expands the application of what financial aid means under 1.600 and in fact spells out the way in which it is presently being interpreted by the Council.

Charles Oldfather (Big Eight Conference): Since passage of Item 33 and its approval is dependent entirely upon the content of Item No. 65, as a newly proposed O.I. 417, to which the Big Eight has an amendment, it seems to me we cannot really reasonably vote on Item 33 and the additional language there without intelligent vote on the content of O.I. 417, Item No. 65. So I move we consider the content of O.I. 417 first before we vote on Proposal No. 33.

President Ramer: The Chair rules the appropriateness of this, unless there happens to be objection. If there is no objection then let's turn to Item 65. Mr. Chapman will present that at this time.

Mr. Chapman: I move the adoption of Item 65.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chapman: I think the intent of Item 65 is very clear: To define financial assistance as being all forms of institutional aid administered by the institution and includes further off-campus employment arranged for by the athletic interests of the institution.

Mr. Oldfather: I think it would be appropriate at this time for me to move an amendment to Item 65 which is found in Amendment K.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Oldfather: Mr. Chairman, I rise in behalf of the Big Eight to speak in favor of this amendment. It is a very limited amendment. We have had a great deal of discussion of the 1.600 rule and perhaps some of the discriminatory aspects. I think it is a practical matter. The problem we are faced with is recruited athletes who in most cases do not qualify under the 1.600 rule and still wish to come to the university of their choice and be on the university campus. He wishes to come there.

All we are proposing is a very limited amendment to make it possible for a young man who wishes to come to the school of his choice, if he cannot get enough help from his parents, if he cannot arrange for a loan of his own which is tied up with his inability to get his parents to get a loan on his own. Theoretically he should come and get a job on his own, but it is virtually impossible in our area and I think in many areas where it would be applicable for any young man to come to the vicinity of your school and get a job on his own and not be said to receive some kind of intercession by the athletic interests of the university, which would include our alumni, to enable him to get this job.

I call your attention to this amendment. All we are doing is pur-

porting to exclude from the definition of financial aid or assistance the bona fide earnings from off-campus employment, and we have added the word "bona fide." So it is clear we are not talking about some job where he punches a clock and never shows up.

We wish at least to have that exception to the extremely broad terms of O.I. 417. I think it is a very limited exception and one in good cause of the occasional athlete who wants to come to our school rather than go to some junior college.

Mr. Chapman: Professor Oldfather, would your interpretation mean that a kid could receive an off-campus job in addition to the athletic scholarship?

Mr. Oldfather: I am talking about the nonqualified boy who comes.

Mr. Chapman: My personal reaction to your proposal is that it is really outside of 1.600. It is the institution's responsibility and something they may initiate. If the institution initiates a job by sending the kid down the street to the corner gas station, they are almost going to have to be responsible for what happens if he gets down there and gets a job. That is my personal opinion.

Mr. Oldfather: I guess I don't understand it then.

Howard MacAdam (State University of New York, Buffalo): I would like to have a point clarified. The question is: If a young man is talked to by a representative of the institution because of his athletic ability and therefore puts your college under consideration, he hasn't taken the SAT, he hasn't taken it until maybe the end of his senior year, and he ends up not predicting; therefore he cannot get any athletic aid. However, he qualifies under the governmental program, comes into your college financed by your state government or the national government. Do you now say that by this he cannot get financial aid?

President Ramer: Alan, would you comment, please?

Mr. Chapman: As it is being interpreted now, that is independent of this O.I. If he was recruited he would be ineligible. If he is not recruited he would be eligible if he receives 1.600, but you may appeal the eligibility to the Council, who will examine the circumstances and the aid given and if it is truly nonathletically related the ineligibility would be waived.

Mr. MacAdam: I would like to say you would have to make a lot of appeals, Mr. Chairman and a lot of kids would have a great fight. I speak against it.

Frank Remington (University of Wisconsin): I would like to address a question, in reference to the question just asked, as to whether or not it is a fact that the institution is in violation at the point where they give financial assistance to a nonpredictor who was a student-athlete within the meaning of O.I. 100. So that the consequence in terms of the question of the gentleman from Buffalo is that they as an institution would be in violation, regardless of whether the student-athlete ever competed at the University of Buffalo.

President Ramer: If I understand correctly, Professor Remington, this was the sense of Professor Chapman's interpretation. Am I wrong?

Mr. Chapman: Well, he would have been a recruited athlete.

Mr. Remington: Mr. Chairman, I might put a hypothetical point, to

illustrate the point I am trying to make. Assume an athlete, before he is determined to be a predictor or nonpredictor, is contacted by the coach within the meaning of O.I. 100. As I read O.I. 100, that means he has been visited by the coach. It is generally determined that he is a nonpredictor, and following that there are no further efforts to recruit this student-athlete.

Independent of the athletic department, an institution award is made under the E.O.P. grant. As I understand the answer of Professor Chapman, as I understand the current interpretation, as I understand the proposal to clarify further that interpretation, the institution would be in violation at the point he received aid, despite the fact that there had been no intervention in his behalf on the part of the athletic department, and even if the athletic department requested the institution not give the aid.

I think it is very important that the convention recognize the extremely broad scope of the prohibition of the current interpretation, the interpretation which would be further solidified by the proposal coming from the Council, most particularly Proposals 33, 65 and 66.

If I might say a word about No. 66, that says the institution—and I take it the athletic department—must declare this student ineligible for financial aid, even if the financial aid is given from sources solely independent of the athletic department.

I would suggest this is not in the interest of the academic aspect of the university nor in the interest of the athletic department that we be required to do so.

I might say, at an appropriate point, I would like to suggest a new O.I. to solve this problem, but I do think it is very much at issue with regard to Item 33 and Item 65 and also the amendment by the Big Eight.

Mr. Chapman: It is my understanding the present posture of the Council is that if they have given this athlete aid it is presumed to be athletic-related until there is an appeal to the Council. In other words, it is not automatically passed until you show that it was indeed nonathletically related, in which case it is not a violation.

Mr. Remington: But does not the violation occur at the time the aid is given by the E.O.P. folks?

Mr. Chapman: At the present time you are right.

Mr. Remington: So the institution is in violation.

Mr. Chapman: It is presumed to be in violation until they show otherwise.

Robley Williams (University of California, Berkeley): I am not sure whether I have a question or a remark, but I will put it in question form. I believe I am speaking in favor of the amendment.

It seems to me that a student in high school really has no option on many occasions as to whether he is a recruited athlete. As I understand it, it is only when he picks up the phone and some coach says, "Johnny, we want you real bad here," he at that moment becomes a recruited athlete, and then all the troubles begin with respect to his getting aid.

I just want to point out that even a recruited athlete doesn't necessarily mean agreement and connivance between the student and the coach. The student can be recruited whether he wants to be or not.

Edwin Cady (University of Indiana): Mr. Chairman, I have been

much concerned about what is involved here for a number of years. It seems to me sometimes in trying to make rules we find ourselves far removed from reality, and we have blundered I think as an association into a situation which is completely intolerable to our institutions.

It works out about this way. I cannot agree with Professor Chapman that there are somehow broad escapes in O.I. 100. I have spent a fair amount of reverie time over the last few years, trying to imagine a situation in which an athlete who might possibly compete on a major level could possibly escape the provision of O.I. 100, and I have not been able to imagine any. It seems to me absolutely inevitable that he will somehow become recruited, he will somehow fall under the provisions of O.I. 100.

I think O.I. 100 needs drastic and radical revision in the name of reality.

We have also the kind of unreality that gets into our language as in No. 33, when we talk about somebody who was awarded aid without consideration of his athletic ability in any degree. I cannot understand this phrase, except that it is absolute, it is a jailhouse. What do you mean by degree—100 degrees, 200 degrees, 300, 600 degrees?

How can you say that you know, you can prove the negative clearly, that not in any degree was a man's athletic ability taken into consideration? It seems to me in terms of practical reality in the world we live in to be mere nonsense, as most absolutes are in the world of man.

The great difficulty with the whole package which we are being asked to legitimize is that it has what seems to me to be disastrous results, and I can put it very plainly by quoting the President of Indiana who had to face this kind of situation which was then an interpretation of the officers of the NCAA and has now become an interpretation of the Council. But it comes down to this: What the President said was: "There is not any possible way in which a man can be ineligible to compete in athletics in Indiana University because he is poor and black and government-aided."

So far as I know the cases around the country are represented perfectly by the President's phrase. The men trapped by this interpretation or this set of interpretations, the men caught in the net have been poor, black and government-aided.

We are attempting to fly in the face of realities, of the decision of the Government to try to get people out of the ghettos, we are attempting to fly in the face of decisions by our state legislatures in many cases to do the same kind of thing. We are attempting to fly in the face of the decisions of our trustees to make the facilities of the university available to people who are poor and black and government-aided, and if you don't think you are flying in the face of your faculties, try it on them for size sometimes. I wouldn't dare.

I am just going to throw this whole package out in a hurry. [Applause]

W. E. Leckie (Colorado School of Mines): I have been a faculty representative for five years and decided to come here this year. I spoke to the faculty representatives the first day on the 1.600. I made the statement that it was my opinion that no one understood the 1.600 rule, and I have been corrected by people at my school, that yes, he

did and that the NCAA Council did. I am now convinced that no one understands the 1.600. [Applause]

I would like to suggest that rather than further confuse the rule with a whole lot of changes, we sit with the "durn" thing until we get it out of the Bylaws provision that it is under and get it in the Constitution in simple language where it belongs.

William Davis (Texas Tech University): Mr. Chairman, I agree completely with the last statement. One time I endeavored to do that very thing. The Eligibility Committee is more confused on this than anybody. We are trying to create a simple, workable, understandable statement, and we would like your tolerance until we can get it completed and sent to you next year. We tried to have it ready for this year and we couldn't get it. I am sorry we didn't because it might have prevented a lot of this.

Mr. Chapman: On one earlier comment about living with reality, I cannot help but think of other realities in athletic recruiting. I imagine the poor, disadvantaged, perhaps black student who is also one hell of an athlete, if he is recruited hard by four or five institutions, I think we ought to protect that kid from having to make his decision solely on the athletic question and not on the educational question.

Edwin Cady (Indiana University): Mr. Chairman, if I may beg your indulgence again, I am informed the people understood my last sentence to mean I thought we ought to throw out 1.600. I didn't mean that. I meant the package of items—No. 33, No. 65 and No. 66.

President Ramer: Thank you for that clarification, Professor Cady. Is there additional discussion?

[Amendment K (page A-35) to Proposal No. 65 (page A-27) was defeated by hand vote.]

Frank Remington (University of Wisconsin): I would like to ask the Chairman if it is appropriate at this time, because it bears very much on this issue, for me to move the adoption of Amendment L in the mimeographed material. If it is, Mr. President, I would like to make that motion, and if it is seconded I would like to ask then consent to a minor editorial change to clarify the purpose of the O.I.

President Ramer: I wonder if we might take that as you see it as an O.I. after we vote on 65. I had agreed earlier, I believe, with Professor Remington that in the treatment of 1.600, Amendment L would be appropriate after the passage of No. 33. Now I am assuming that with the approval of No. 65, that Item 33 has at the same time really been approved.

We will vote on that separately then. In any event, may we withhold the interpretation proposed until after the vote on No. 33 and No. 65? Is this agreeable?

Mr. Remington: I don't have any particular objection.

President Ramer: All right. Thank you. We are facing the main motion, Item 65. The amendment has been defeated, Amendment K. Is there further discussion of Item 65 on the agenda?

[Proposal No. 65 (page A-27) was defeated by hand vote.]

President Ramer: Now, I assumed that No. 33 might fall under that, but I am in error on that, I am sure, and let's face Item 33 in the agenda. Professor Chapman, referring and returning now to the approval of Item 33, that was seconded I believe. Is there discussion?

[Proposal No. 33 (pages A-14-15) was defeated by hand vote.]
Frank Remington (University of Wisconsin): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Amendment L in the mimeographed material.
[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Remington: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to amend line 3 of the proposal to read as follows: "Article 4, Section 6-(b)-(i)."

President Ramer: Gentlemen, this would represent the insertion of Arabic "i" in parentheses, immediately following "Section 6-(b)." The Chair rules this to be editorial in change and we will proceed on that basis unless there is objection.

Mr. Remington: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the editorial change is to clarify the fact that the objective of O.I. 419 as proposed is to clarify the eligibility of the nonpredictor for institutional aid not related to his athletic ability. It is not to deal with the issue of his eligibility for practice as a freshman nor competition as a freshman, nor is it intended to deal with his eligibility for aid in the years after his freshman year, as dealt with in paragraph (ii) nor his eligibility as a transfer student as dealt with in paragraph (iii).

The purpose of the O.I. is to make clear that in a situation in which a student-athlete is recruited within the meaning of O.I. 100, before it is determined that he is a nonpredictor, and where following that determination there is no further effort to recruit him, and he is admitted to the institution for financial aid based on criteria independent of his athletic ability, he may receive that aid without loss of permanent eligibility as now provided, as I understand the current interpretation, and without the institution's being in violation because it awarded aid under the no-need program under the basis of the criteria independent of his athletic ability.

Recognizing the difficulty that I am sure the Council is concerned about, of proof in these cases, you notice the last sentence in this O.I. says, to paraphrase it, that there must be no intervention on the part of the athletic interests other than the fact that they may notify him of the existence of the financial aid program, including the O.E.G. program. Any further interference is in itself a violation of the Bylaws unless the institution shows to the contrary, thus putting the burden on the institution to justify that.

It seems to me, Mr. President, this is a workable and practical compromise and, more important, this has value as being defensible in principle. It allows the O.E.G. program to deal independently of the athletic interests, and it seems to me that is the objective that any academic institution ought to have, and that is the objective we ought to have who are concerned with intercollegiate athletics.

So I urge your support of O.I. 419.

Clyde C. Walton (Northern Illinois University): I would like to speak briefly in support of 419. In the institution I represent we have a program which is called CHACE. It is a rather tortured acronym for Complete Help and Assistance for a College Education. It is a federally funded program whose purpose is to help disadvantaged youths go to college. It is quite frankly aimed at black students.

Because of the tests to determine admissibility, which are based on wide experience and perhaps have little applicability in testing students of black neighborhoods, we admit students to CHACE on other bases than the traditional tests.

The CHACE program, I want to say quite freely was never created as a vehicle for the admission of athletes. That is not its purpose. Its purpose is to get disadvantaged students into the school. We are afraid, however, the existence of this program is getting us into trouble with Article 4, Section 6-(b) through no fault of our own.

The CHACE program has its own staff. They are completely independent of the athletic department and the athletic board. We have little information about the students they are contacting and propose to get to come to our school. We have nothing to do with their basic activities, yet they are putting us in a very difficult spot.

I think we can all agree, gentlemen, that these programs for the disadvantaged that are with us now are likely to stay for quite a while. This 419 we are talking about I think will help us to get out of the box we are being put in. It allows us to avoid discriminating against this group of students. I think it specifies conditions imposed by these particular programs that make them acceptable and more palatable to us all. I think this amendment makes a more effective legislation for us, legislation to help us rather than hinder us.

I most respectfully urge the members of this convention to support 419.

Mr. Chapman: I am afraid—I hope not though—that the remarks are being taken in opposition to these programs. I feel personally they are quite laudable and everyone should have them.

What bothers me is that a seemingly attractive athlete is being interviewed by two or more institutions with this program, and this poor kid is going to be badgered by the athletic department to recruit him, and it will lead to the exploitation of these young men.

Mr. Remington: Mr. President, may I say one further word? It is true that difficult problems of recruiting can be successfully and practically dealt with by making everybody guilty, the innocent as well as the guilty ones. The only trouble with that it seems to me is that it is most unwise and unfair. I don't think this organization, fearful of violation, ought to cast a cloud on institutions and more importantly on students who have not done anything wrong. Yet I think that is the effect of following the advice to be practical about these matters.

I think there are times when it is very much more important to be right in principle than it is to be practical. We do have enforcement procedure. They do have a difficult job, but that is in the nature of enforcement.

I would say unless they can show a violation we ought not to assume the guilt of the young people and the guilt of academic institutions without some proof that they have done something wrong.

Howard MacAdams (State University College, Buffalo): I would like to have something clarified at this particular point. The way this 1.600 rule is stated now and the way we have all attempted to interpret it, I do not look at it as a violation, I am very surprised to hear the Council would look at it as a violation, if they had a program like the CHACE program or we have a SEAT program the same way.

Whether or not he was ever talked to before he took the SAT test and then found he was nonpredictive, at that point that he was added in with a whole group of kids because of his economic and academic background, I don't think that is in violation. I don't think we need any more additions. I think it stands right now if we understand it

that way. I don't think we have to write any more particularly to define.

I would like clarification from the Council because I don't look at it as a violation.

Mr. Chapman: As the Council has interpreted it up to now, it is judged as a violation unless this Amendment L were adopted.

[Amendment L (page A-35) was approved by hand vote.]

President Ramer: We move now to Item 34 in the yellow sheets, and I will ask Professor Jesse Hill to present this for the Council.

Jesse Hill (Pacific Coast Athletic Conference): Mr. President, I move to amend the Bylaws, Article 4, Section 6-(b) as outlined in Proposal No. 34.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Hill: The attempt of this amendment is to clarify the determination of the 1.600 as far as the transfer student is concerned. [Proposal No. 34 (page A-15) was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: We take next Item 35, and we are asking Professor Reed from Lincoln University to present this to the convention for the Council.

Dwight T. Reed (Lincoln University): I move the adoption of Item No. 35.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Ramer: You have read the proposed intent, namely the maintenance of a file certifying that each eligible student-athlete meets the minimum requirements. Is there discussion?

Michael Fleischer (Herbert H. Lehman College): I am a little nervous about this thing, keeping files and having them available for examination upon request. I am not sure my institution will agree to opening their files on request. It is not specified who is requesting it, and it might be a violation of their institutional autonomy. I think it is another broad type of program that should not be adopted without looking into it.

Keeping a file of all students is something we might do institutionally, and I understand the NCAA regards the certification of eligibility to be an institutional prerogative. I think that would be a violation of that principle also. I urge you to vote against it.

Mr. Reed: I think the intent of this is to get the institution who may declare an athlete eligible for national competition and for some reason or other some other institution that is competing might want to know or want to have a source of information regarding that individual.

I can think of track championships where teams are certified as eligible and we have difficulty finding if they were eligible prior to taking part in the event. I think all this does is give us a source of information so we can immediately find those individuals eligible.

President Ramer: I think it is assumed, of course, that this eligibility continues, with the faculty representative of that institution. I think the assumption was that these files become available to the Infractions Committee of the Association and to the Eligibility Committee before participation in actual events. I believe this was the intent.

Is there further discussion?

[Proposal No. 35 (pages A-15-16) was approved by hand vote.]

President Ramer: Now we are facing Item 61, and Ernie Casale will present this for the Council.

Ernest Casale (Temple University): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 61.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 61 (page A-25) was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: Item 62. The Chair recognizes Professor Alan Chapman to present this in behalf of the Council.

Mr. Chapman: Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Item 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chapman: This proposal rises out of the Committee on Academic Assistance as a means by which a student who did not complete high school and receive a diploma can be qualified for 1.600 by taking the GED test.

[Proposal No. 62 (pages No. A-25-26) was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: We are facing Item 63. The Chair recognizes Joe Learney, Director of Athletics at the University of Washington.

Joseph Learney (University of Washington): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Item No. 63.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Learney: This is an effort to provide a way and means for the nonrecruited walkon athlete, particularly in the schools that do not require the SAT or the ACT as an admission device, and also to give the persons involved in fall sports an opportunity to be a walkon and get involved in many sports that are available in many institutions during the fall quarter or fall semester.

John A. Fuzak (Michigan State University): Mr. Chairman, I am speaking in behalf of the Council in opposing this proposal. I think it is fairly clear to a good many of our members the kind of problems we have had with residual tests. It is true that the results of the residual tests would later be related, but there is not that much hardship when the prediction has not been determined to withhold the student until it has been determined on a national test base.

First of all the testing services indicate a lack of confidence in their security. It is a different test that is used, and the conditions of administering them vary from one point to another, and as the convention or the members of it know we have had great problems with it. All we would do is produce a good deal of confusion.

I would like to point out, in terms of the action already taken by this convention, we would have or might have students competing in football and fall sports for some time before there was any notion of whether they predicted or not.

For the unscrupulous I believe this would be a very great opportunity for exploitation, because I feel sure there are some people who would attempt to persuade students not to take the tests, so that they could compete at least for a while until this thing went on.

So I would urge in behalf of the Council that you vote negatively on this proposal.

Mr. Learney: Just an additional item. We had the experience last fall that a number of athletes got into football, soccer and water polo who were not recruited. Our institution did not require and does not require SAT or ACT for admission purposes. They came down, were given the opportunity to stay with the squad while they were tested

at the national date. By the time the data was returned to our institution the season was all over, and this was their last opportunity to get on the squad. They left because they were not of the caliber to go to the varsity level.

[Proposal No. 62 (pages A-25-26) was defeated by voice vote.]

President Ramer: We are now facing No. 64, and the Chair recognizes Professor Lou Myers of the University of Arizona, to present this for the Council.

Louis A. Myers (University of Arizona): Mr. President, I move the adoption of the Proposal No. 64.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Myers: The intent is to limit weighting of test scores and high school records in the development of the 1,600 prediction table, to assure that both variables are given adequate consideration.

[Proposal No. 64 (page A-26) was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: Gentlemen, we move to No. 66, and the Chair recognizes Professor Swank, who will present this to the convention on behalf of the Council.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Item No. 66 to add a new O.I. 418.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Swank: Further, I would also move the adoption of Amendment G, more in the nature of an editorial change than anything else, by adding "by his institution" which the agency would have to do anyway.

I move the adoption of Amendment G.

[The amendment was seconded, and Amendment G (page A-34) was approved by voice vote.]

Mr. Swank: Very briefly, in reference to Item 66, it is stated the intent is to formalize what presently exists. What it does is declare the individual ineligible if he has not qualified under 4-6-(b). He loses one year if he has gained a year improperly, and if he is given financial aid he is permanently ineligible. However in both instances the institution may appeal to the Council.

It also provides if the individual loses his eligibility it shall only apply at the institution involved, and he could go to another institution and be eligible there.

This is really to prevent an institution from competing because they know they can very easily lose the man if they participate in that activity.

[Proposal No. 66 (page A-27), as amended, was approved by voice vote.]

Coaching Schools

William Flynn (Boston College): There seems to be some confusion among some of us who have discussed Item 51, having to do with Coaching Schools. It was defeated 179 to 172.

Several Delegates: It was passed.

President Ramer: What is the number of the item?

Mr. Flynn: I am sorry. No. 51. No. 51 was defeated.

Delegates: No, passed.

Mr. Flynn: I am sorry. It did pass, 179 to 172. Now the question many of us have is that the title, Coaching Schools, seems to be confusing. Does this have to do with specialized sports camps? Is that

what we mean by coaching schools?

President Ramer: I would like to ask Commissioner Jordan if he might express the intent of the Southern Conference representatives and the Collegiate Commissioners Association in that regard. Is Commissioner Jordan available?

Lloyd P. Jordan (Southern Conference): Mr. Chairman. Bill, will you state that again, please?

Mr. Flynn: Does this have to do with specialized sports camps?

Mr. Jordan: It has to do with specialized camps in which young men are recruited, yes.

Mr. Flynn: Some of the members feel it was confusing, in that it was entitled "Coaching Schools," that it had to do with coaches, and had to do with students demonstrating. Therefore, I would like to move reconsideration of this particular article of amendment.

Mr. Jordan: Mr. Chairman, this is not a proposal of the Southern Conference. I am representing the Collegiate Commissioners who have studied this for a number of years. This was presented by the Collegiate Commissioners Association. Many of the delegates have left the convention. It appears very unfair to those who voted to have this come back before the convention. If it does come back, why not bring everything back?

President Ramer: Thank you, Professor Jordan. The Chair recognizes the motion to reconsider made by Bill Flynn of Boston College. Is there a second to that motion?

[The motion was seconded.]

We are facing the motion to reconsider our earlier action on No. 51, page 38. Is there discussion?

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 57 (page A-22) was defeated by hand vote.]

President Ramer: We return now, gentlemen, to the Transfer Rule items as recorded toward the bottom of Column 1, and I invite your attention—

Member (Interposing): Mr. Chairman, on the past motion that was acted on by the house, I would like to respectfully request to eliminate the confusion in O.I. 112, that "sport schools" be written in there. This is quite confusing, believe me, and if that is what the spirit and intent of the legislation is, I think it should be so defined and written into O.I. 112.

I would like to address this to the Council to have it written into O.I. 112 to clear it up.

President Ramer: In response to this suggestion I would ask Mr. Byers to place this on the agenda for consideration of the Council. It is so ordered. Thank you.

Transfer Rule

[Proposal No. 25 (page A-11) was withdrawn without dissent.]

President Ramer: We proceed to Item No. 26. I will ask Professor Ilg to present this for the Council.

George F. Ilg (Fresno State College): Mr. Chairman, I move to amend Bylaw Article 4, Section 1-(d).

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 26 (pages A-11-12) was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: No. 27 on the same page. We will ask Professor Ilg again to present this for us.

Mr. Ilg: Mr. Chairman, I move to amend Bylaws Article 4, Section 1-(e).

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 27 (page A-12) was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: We move, gentlemen, to Item 58. The source of this is Kent State University. As I indicated on Thursday, this also received Council endorsement. Is there someone from Kent State to present this?

Milo Lude (Kent State University): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Item No. 58 to amend O.I. 400-(b).

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Lude: Mr. Chairman, this is merely to make those people eligible as student-athletes who transfer from an institution which has discontinued their sport at the first institution and make them immediately eligible for NCAA events at the new institution.

[Proposal No. 58 (pages A-24-25) was approved by voice vote.]

Alien Student-Athletes

President Ramer: Now we will move to items concerning Alien Student-Athletes, No. 28. The source of this is the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. The Chair recognizes Dr. Schultze of Twin Cities.

Max O. Schultze (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I move the adoption of the amendment to Article 4, Section 1-(f)-(2).

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Schultze: I would also like to move an amendment to the amendment which is presented as Amendment M.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Schultze: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: The amendment to the amendment is a modification which has been suggested to me by one of the wise members of this organization. It substitutes the wording, "except that he may participate throughout the seasons in sports which are in progress or begin during the school year in which he reaches his eighteenth birthday," for the wording which has been crossed out, immediately preceding that.

Adolph Samborski (Yankee Conference): Mr. Chairman, I would like to oppose No. 28 in behalf of the Council. The thrust of the legislation embodied in Bylaw Article 4, Section 2 is to discourage the recruitment of older alien athletes and to provide greater opportunity for United States citizens to participate in NCAA championships. It is an attempt to equalize competitive opportunities between aliens and American students.

Last year the convention voted to lower from 20 to 19 the age at which alien student-athletes may participate in their own country without the loss of varsity collegiate eligibility in this country. We would like to leave the present legislation alone for a few years to see if equalizing balance has been effected.

Part 1 of this amendment is a bit more restrictive on alien students, but Part 2 opens the roll to full eligibility for older-age alien student-athletes, if they can be established as not having been recruited.

I can see frightening possibilities in this that would upset adversely the objective of equalizing the competitive opportunities in NCAA championships between alien and American students. I urge

the defeat of this amendment.

President Ramer: Thank you, Mr. Samborski. Any further discussion?

Mr. Schultze: Mr. Chairman, it was my impression we were discussing the amendment to the amendment.

President Ramer: That is correct. Dr. Schultze.

[Amendment M (page A-36) was defeated by voice vote.]

Mr. Schultze: May I speak to Item No. 28?

The purpose of this amendment proposal is threefold.

It is, as Commissioner Samborski suggested, an extension of action taken last year.

The first purpose is to give an even date to United States student-athletes who are competing against aliens who have been imported, who are older, who in many instances have been specifically imported into this country so they may compete. I would urge your most earnest consideration because I think our home kids deserve an even break.

Secondly, the action which was adopted last year has certain definite flaws. It provided for a cutoff date of the nineteenth birthday. If the boy competes in a foreign country after that nineteenth birthday he loses one year of eligibility. This means that he has to make a decision to quit his competition in the middle of the season, and this would bring a lot of ill will, and furthermore it will tend to keep away boys who otherwise would be inclined to come to the United States for an education and for competition.

The third point to which I would like to invite your attention is the fact that the legislation which is now on our books is seriously discriminatory against aliens simply because they are alien students, and I do not believe we can live with this kind of situation. I do not believe we have to fear the importation of people who are older if it is clear that they will lose eligibility if they receive financial aid based on athletic ability.

We have much precedent for this particular consideration.

Now, in respect to the age, I have some statistics collected from information which is provided through exchange of data by members of the Western College Athletic Association, and these statistics show that 93 per cent of the student-athletes who participate in hockey in those schools matriculate before their nineteenth birthday, and only 67 per cent of the aliens matriculate before their nineteenth birthday. Therefore our boys are at a very definite disadvantage against aliens who are more mature and more competitive because of experience, and who have been recruited because they are outstanding athletes, and in many cases our people are walk-ons and they are not needed.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Gentlemen, one more point. I assume that if this were adopted it would not become effective until students have matriculated for the fall season or the fall school term in 1972. In other words, it would not affect students who are now in attendance.

President Ramer: Thank you, Dr. Schultze. Dr. Schultze is correct in assuming the effective date of this. The effective date of such new legislation as we are considering is August 1 unless determined by the convention or the Council otherwise.

Herbert Gallagher (Northeastern University): Mr. President, I wish to speak against this proposed amendment. The reason for that is that this is strictly a hockey problem and not a problem in other sports, but the legislation affects all sports. It is my feeling, gentlemen, that we should not pass legislation affecting all athletes from foreign nations because of one problem in one little area.

I am very much against this legislation.

L. R. Marti (University of North Dakota): Mr. President, I would like to speak in opposition to this also. I agree with Herb Gallagher. I think last year we lowered the age to 19, and as one of the previous speakers mentioned, I would like to play with that and see how it works out. It has worked out quite well. I don't think we should be legislating further at this time.

[Proposal No. 28 (pages A-12-13) was defeated by voice vote.]

Ice Hockey Eligibility

President Ramer: We now move to Item No. 44. Source—Michigan Technological University and several other institutions join in this. Is there a representative from one of these institutions here?

Ross Johnson (Michigan Technological University): Mr. Chairman, I move that we adopt No. 44, amending O.I. 5.

[The motion was seconded.]

Adolph W. Samborski (Yankee Conference): Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the Council again, I oppose this amendment or proposal. Last year the present legislation was adopted. There was very, very little, if any, dissent. It came as a recommendation from the Special NCAA Hockey Committee. The main reason for it was the bar of professionalism that surrounded those leagues.

Now, in the proposal here it mentions three games after January 10. In actuality this would mean that a young man participating in that season would by that time have played 30 or 40 games, where only one game would professionalize him, because there are professionals on those teams, and whether he receives any money or not, he is playing with professionals. That in itself would professionalize him.

There are weekly stipends that would subsidize with professional hockey funds.

In view of those remarks, I urge the defeat of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 44 (page A-20) was defeated by voice vote.]

Off-Campus Visitation

Wade Stinson (University of Kansas) (Interposing): May I interrupt at this point? I would like to refer to an item of business that we took care of this morning. Item No. 16. The question was divided, and the second part was passed. I refer to "On any visits neither the staff member (nor any representative of the institution) may expend any funds other than necessary for his own personal expenses."

Would I be out of order in moving that the rule become effective immediately?

President Ramer: Our parliamentarian rules this would be out of order. Would you like to comment on that, Harry?

Harry M. Cross (University of Washington, Parliamentarian): This becomes a substitute in its operating effect, inasmuch as the anticipation of the members not attending the convention is that they will

not have the ground rules changed during the course of this year. The only time we had anything different was when as a general proposition there was a major set of revisions and something needed to be done currently. That was a situation of which the membership was advised in advance. This I assume would be entirely out of order.

Mr. Stinson: Thank you.

Waivers

President Ramer: Thank you, Wade. Gentlemen, we return to Item No. 30, dealing with the matter of Waivers. Commissioner Samborski of Yankee Conference approaches the microphone. Mr. Samborski, will you present this to the convention?

Adolph Samborski (Yankee Conference): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal 30, which would permit the same waiver procedures in connection with the World University games that are now available relative to the Pan American and Olympic games.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 30 (page A-13) was approved by voice vote.]

Transfers of Membership

President Ramer: We move now back toward the top of Column 2 with two amendments concerning Transfers of Membership. The first of these is Item 36, and Professor Samborski, I will call on you again to present Item 36 having to do with transfer of district membership, as indicated.

Mr. Samborski: Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal 36 which would permit the institutions in bold type, in Numbers 36 and 37, to transfer district membership as indicated.

President Ramer: The Chair assumes the motion to apply to both 36 and 37, with one provision, namely your unanimous consent to 37 in its recognition on this floor. As we mentioned Thursday, this was not in on time, and our consideration of it will depend on the fact there is no objection from the floor. There being no objection, we are recognizing the motion to approve 36 and 37. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

C. D. Henry (Grambling College): Mr. President, representing the Southwestern Athletic Conference, we would like to add to 37-(b) Mississippi Valley State College, Itta Bena, Mississippi, and the intent would be to have all schools in our conference in the same district. Mississippi Valley State College, Itta Bena, Mississippi.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Ramer: All right, we will consider this a part of Item 37.

[Proposals No. 36 and 37 (pages A-16-17) were approved by voice vote.]

Committees

President Ramer: That completes the Transfer of Membership. We go now to Items 38, 39 and 40. I will ask Frank Carver to present Item No. 38 to the convention on behalf of the Council, also Items 39 and 40.

Frank R. Carver (University of Pittsburgh): Mr. President, with the permission of the Chair, I would like to put a motion for the adoption of the three items—38, 39 and 40—in one single item. Then I move, Mr. President, the adoption of Items 38, 39 and 40.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposals No. 38, 39, and 40 (pages A-17-18) were approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: We move now to Item 41 on page 35, and I am asking Professor Swank to present it as a member of the Council.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Item 41, amending Article 7, Section 2-(p).

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Swank: Very briefly, this is to change the Olympic Committee to the International Relations Committee. The purpose, of course, is that we are now having the World University games, and this is to give this committee the opportunity to supervise a broader base. We would urge the adoption.

[Proposal No. 41 (page A-19) was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: We move with your consent to the consideration of Item 42. There being no objection—I am sorry. Yes?

Stanley J. Marshall (South Dakota State University): I am representing the College Committee. The College Committee wishes to withhold consent to discuss No. 42 because we are in the process of a committee study of establishing separate College Committee meet and tournament committees.

President Ramer: The Chair honors that withholding of consent. Nevertheless if it is the desire of some representative on the floor to move our consideration of it, I believe we can consider it with a simple majority. Mr. Parliamentarian, is that correct? Is there anyone who desires to move the approval of Item 42?

[Proposal No. 42 (page A-19) was withdrawn without dissent.]

National College Division Soccer Championship

President Ramer: Item No. 74. Source—National Collegiate Athletic Association Executive Committee, Soccer Rules and Tournament Committee. As indicated on Thursday, this also has the endorsement of the Council. Is there someone to present this resolution for the Council? Do I hear a motion that it be approved?

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 74 (page A-30) was approved by voice vote.]

Officiating

President Ramer: We move now to the consideration of Item 46. This is a constitutional revision presented to us by Mr. Fuzak.

John Fuzak (Michigan State University): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment to the Constitution O.I. 11, page 11.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 46 (page A-21) was approved by voice vote.]

Tryout Rule

President Ramer: We move to the consideration of Item No. 50. Howard Gentry of Tennessee State will present this motion for the Council.

Howard Gentry (Tennessee State University): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Item 50.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 50 (page A-22) was approved by voice vote.]

Transfer Rule

President Ramer: We come now to the consideration of the Transfer Rule, Item 54. Is there some representative from one of the sponsoring institutions, one of the institutional sources here to present this?

J. O. Coppedge (U. S. Naval Academy): Mr. President, in representing the four service academies, I would move the adoption of Item No. 54 to amend the Bylaws as specified there.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Coppedge: This is to prevent people from coming to the campuses of the service academies during the late summer and recruiting, which is not prevented in the present rules.

[Proposal No. 54 (page A-23) was approved by voice vote.]

Football Open Dates

President Ramer: We move to the consideration of Item 55 and Professor George Ilg will represent the Council in presenting this to the Association.

George F. Ilg (Fresno State College): Mr. President, I move to amend the Bylaws O.I. 303, shown in No. 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Ilg: I believe the intent is quite clear. We had a situation last fall where an institution was involved in a serious problem where three of their coaches were killed in an airplane accident and the game was held in Fullerton, California for the benefit of the families of the three coaches. This is to permit situations like this to happen.

[Proposal No. 55 (pages A-23-24) was approved by voice vote.]

President Ramer: We move to Item 56, and Professor Swank approaches the microphone to present this matter to the convention.

Football Season

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Item No. 56, amending O.I. 300.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 56 (page A-24) was approved by voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 56 (page A-25) was withdrawn without dissent.]

Administration of Aid

President Ramer: We move to No. 67. The Chair recognizes Dean McWhorter.

H. Boyd McWhorter (University of Georgia): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, on behalf of the Council, the Council would like to withdraw No. 67 on page 43 and substitute for that Amendment H on the green sheets. Amendment H, as you see, is an amendment to O.I. 15 and spells out specifically the Council's posture in regard to money from outside sources going to athletics. The underlined portion shows that a donor cannot contribute funds for a particular individual, earmarked as such. A donor may contribute funds for a particular sport, but the institution must maintain exclusive right to use such funds in any manner in which it sees fit, which may well include grants in aid.

I move its adoption.

[Proposal No. 67 (page A-27) was withdrawn without dissent.]

President Ramer: Thank you, Boyd. The Chair responds affirmatively to the proposal withdrawing No. 67 provided there is no objection from the floor, and in so doing recognizes the presentation of Amendment H on the green sheet, as presented by Dr. McWhorter. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

[Amendment H (page A-34) was approved by voice vote.]

11. OTHER PROPOSALS

Revisions of Executive Regulations

President Ramer: We move to Executive Regulations—No. 68, No. 70 and No. 71. You will recall the statement of the Chair in our opening session on Thursday to the effect that these are Executive Regulations presently in effect. They are presented to this Convention for review here on the floor. They may be discussed, they may be indeed overturned if that is the desire.

We will take first Item No. 68. I would like to call on Commissioner Stan Bates of Western Athletic Conference to comment on that particular proposal.

Stan Bates (Western Athletic Conference): Mr. Chairman, I believe this is explained very thoroughly in Amendment Proposal No. 68, (page A-28). There has been one change, if you will refer to the underlined portion: "and he or the institution knew or had reason to know of his ineligibility."

As President Ramer said, this is in effect at the present time. It is for your information, for any consideration or questions you have on this.

President Ramer: Gentlemen, this is Amendment I (page A-34) to that Executive Regulation.

We move then, gentlemen, to Executive Regulation No. 69. Is there comment? The Chair recognizes the delegate from Stanford University.

Delegate (Stanford University): Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the revision of No. 69, (page A-28). We have already been reminded at this convention that intercollegiate athletics is perhaps the last bastion of the discipline line. Many of the traditional values have been formerly rejected by a large number of youngsters over the world, and competitive sports it seems to me has successfully defended and preserved the time-honored principle that one's objective can only be reached by means of vigorous training, and no one of us will deny that the NCAA has taken the lead in this movement.

One has only to read the booklet on drugs and the posters to know that the Association is unequivocally opposed to self-indulgence as a philosophy of life. Indeed the thousands of bright-eyed youngsters are the Association's very emblem.

I view with personal alarm and deep disappointment the relaxation of NCAA standards in allowing malt beverages, as they call it, in our Association's sponsored broadcasts. Now we are going even further and increasing this kind of advertising which will be allowed.

I have great confidence in the Executive Committee and the Council. I know they have problems that I haven't even dreamed of, but I want to plead with them for reconsideration of this danger. No matter what we may tell ourselves to the contrary, these advertisements constitute an implied endorsement of the products.

Gentlemen, it is hardly necessary to explain that we are woefully inconsistent in this instance, and I am going to ask you to guard very carefully against this desecration of what I consider the basic principle of this organization.

President Ramer: Thank you. I am sure the Executive Committee will take those observations into due consideration.

We move now to Executive Regulation No. 70. The Chair recognizes Commissioner Coleman of the Southeastern Conference.

Tonto Coleman (Southeastern Conference): Mr. President, Proposal No. 70 (page A-28) I think is self-explanatory. However there is one amendment that the Committee has added, to say: "The executive director, for good reason, may authorize exceptions to this paragraph." It is for economy and to save money if you want to put it simply.

President Ramer: Thank you, Commissioner Coleman.

We move to Executive Regulation No. 71, (page A-29). Professor Plant, University of Michigan.

Marcus Plant (University of Michigan): Mr. President, I would like to add to the material as it appears on the printed pages this fact, that it is essentially an accounting regulation and the Extra Events Committee approached the Executive Committee asking about an effective date and the Committee determined it would go into effect today, January 8.

The reason the Extra Events Committee raised the question is it will have some impact and they wanted to know exactly what the impact would be on some bowls, and they wanted time to study it, so it will not affect the accounting for the bowl games of 1972, the ones that occurred on January 1. It will affect the bowl games that occur hereafter, however, and in the meantime the Extra Events Committee will have approximately a year to study that.

Enforcement Procedure

President Ramer: Thank you for that explanation, Professor Plant. Gentlemen, we are moving to consideration of Item 72 concerning Enforcement Procedure. The Chair would like to call upon Professor Frank Carver of the University of Pittsburgh for elaboration on that, in behalf of the Council.

Frank Carver (University of Pittsburgh): Mr. President, I believe the explanation is rather clear as given in your books on page 45 of Item 72. The purpose is to clarify the procedure. Of course, the procedure is also to expedite the appeals by the membership in any decision by the officers or the Council. For specific reasons, this is very much in order.

I am sorry, Mr. President. I move approval of the amendment of Section 7 of the Enforcement Procedure as outlined in Item 72.

[The motion was seconded, and Proposal No. 72 (page A-29) was approved by voice vote.]

Basketball Television

President Ramer: We have dealt previously with Items 76, 77 and 73, so we move to Item 75. The Chair recognizes Jim Decker, Chairman of our Television Committee, approaching the microphone.

James H. Decker (Syracuse University): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Resolution No. 75.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Decker: Mr. President, I propose an amendment to this resolution as shown on the green sheet, Amendment R, which changes the wording in paragraph No. 5, where the words are set out and the new words are underlined. I so move.

[The motion was seconded.]

Cecil Coleman (Wichita State University): While admittedly there has been a great deal of basketball television going on by our member institutions, either in packages or by the individual institutions, College Division and University Division, there is no question that this has been a real source of income to a number of these institutions. There is a great possibility that if this came under the control plan, such as football is, with the Television Committee, these moneys would be eliminated from many of the institutions that now have the bargaining power and the opportunity to negotiate with their individual and local people, either through their conferences or independently, with their local television stations.

There is also the possibility of many of the tournament television programs that are currently going on, that sponsoring agencies would be hurt. I think we all know what many of these do in our service clubs, service organizations. It concerns our conference also in that it hurts the small promoter as differentiated from the large networks who have done so much to promote the entire intercollegiate program, that they could be left out.

We would urge the delegates to defeat this resolution.

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference): While there are problems admittedly to the television program, I believe it is possible for those who have the programs to satisfactorily solve this problem. We have been able to do it, within our conference, by working with the High School Athletic Associations to prohibit the telecast on nights when they have their games. They schedule around it very well.

I would also like to call to the attention of the group that there are many contracts which are to be in effect for a year, which would have to be voided.

I would urge its defeat.

Thomas Niland (LeMoyne College-Syracuse): I would like to urge the adoption of this rule. For instance this year, our Christmas tournament was designed to be self-sufficient. It has been in the past. It suffered greatly by the fact that the Kodak Classic was broadcast in Syracuse at the same time we had our finals.

I do think there has to be some way of controlling it. Those who have television have a great advantage, but what about those who are trying to get people to the ball game and don't have the advantage of television? We are being mortified.

F. A. Dry (University of Tulsa): I think with the inconsistency of the football plan that now exists, we would find the same thing and do find the same thing happening as described by the gentleman who preceded me. So I urge the vote against this resolution.

[Amendment R (page A-37) was defeated by hand vote.]

President Ramer: We are now facing Resolution No. 75 as presented by Mr. Decker without the amendment. Is there further discussion? [Proposal No. 75 (page A-30) was defeated by voice vote.]

Transfer Rule

J. O. Coppedge (United States Naval Academy): Mr. Chairman, No. 54, which was passed, I would like to know if it is in order to make it effective on the date of July 1, 1972, as compared to August 1, as of July.

President Ramer: Professor Cross, I wonder if you will comment on this question by Professor Coppedge, on the feasibility or practicability.

Mr. Cross: Yes. This is an official interpretation. Unless some other effective date is put on an official interpretation it becomes effective when adopted by the Council unless overruled by the convention, so it is in effect now.

Official Interpretations

Robert Whitelaw (Eastern Collegiate Athletic Conference): President Ramer, are we open for new business?

This is about the new O.I. as approved by the NCAA Council. May I raise it at this point?

President Ramer: I am sorry. Will you repeat that?

Mr. Whitelaw: I am also chairman of the Professional Relations Committee, and we were quite disturbed and concerned over the NCAA Council's O.I. that appeared in the October 1 issue of the NCAA NEWS, the Official Interpretation being that if a student-athlete accepts a complimentary ticket from a professional sports organization this prevents the student from entering competition. I gather, as we may take no action at this particular convention on this particular point, this is a binding O.I.

Representing the Professional Relations Committee, we are concerned about this, because we feel this particular fact has done no appreciable harm to the student-athlete, and if this is the case the student-athlete may have benefited.

Also we question whether this action could be considered a form of financial assistance when asking for free complimentary tickets.

President Ramer: I am going to ask Harry Cross, our parliamentarian, to comment on this. Is this interpretation already in the Constitution and Bylaws?

Mr. Whitelaw: No. It appeared in the October 1 NCAA NEWS, which I gather when it is published is binding upon the membership.

President Ramer: That is correct. This appeared, Harry, in the October 1 publication of the NCAA.

Mr. Cross: I am not sure whether this question was raised earlier. At this time in the afternoon it is a little hard to tell what has been raised when.

An interpretation may be reviewed under the provisions of the Constitution on page 22 of the pink pages, if the request for its review was made by one o'clock yesterday. So it cannot be reviewed in this fashion, but I think you can be advised that the question you are raising is on the agenda for the Council tomorrow, and you could be invited to appear before the Council in the morning.

Mr. Whitelaw: Could I get the consensus of the members whether they would favor this particular approach? Is it in accordance with the group, or is it just the Professional Relations Committee's opinion on this particular point?

Mr. Cross: It seems to me this is the sort of thing that is not that simple to handle, and it would hardly be fair to the membership present or those who have gone, to ask that this be done this late. The Council can, of course, have sufficient time to discuss it and the value of your disagreement with the interpretation.

I believe I would rule, Mr. Chairman, that request is out of order.

12. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

President Ramer: Thank you, Harry. You will be advised of further consideration of that by the Council tomorrow.

Gentlemen, I invite your attention to the agenda as printed on page 9 of the white pages. We are moving now to the Report of the Committee on Committees, and I am requesting at this time that Commissioner Jordan, of the Southern Conference, Chairman of that Committee, make his report to the convention. Commissioner Jordan.

Lloyd P. Jordan (Southern Conference): Mr. President, The Committee on Committees, having been duly appointed by the Council of the Association and being in session under date of Wednesday, January 5, wishes to express thanks for the opportunity of being of service as well as to express sincere gratitude to Miss Fannie Vaughan for her assistance and the presentation to the Committee members a working manual the contents of which were duly studied, enabling the Committee to give full consideration to all nominees for vacancies on committees for which they are responsible and their leadership potential.

The nominations which have been distributed to the delegates represent those members endorsed for appointment to the designated committees for the terms specified.

Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the Committee's nominations.

[The motion was seconded, put to a voice vote and carried.]

13. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

President Ramer: We move next to the report of the Nominating Committee. The Chair recognizes Alan Chapman, Chairman of that Committee.

Alan J. Chapman (Rice University): Mr. Chairman, the 1972 Nominating Committee appointed by the Council is listed on page 10 in the white pages of your book. In a meeting last night the Committee nominated for you the following gentlemen:

For President—Earl M. Ramer
University of Tennessee

For Secretary-Treasurer—Samuel E. Barnes
District of Columbia Teachers College

On the Council—

Vice-President of District 1—
Robert W. Pritchard
Worcester Polytechnic Institute

Vice-President of District 3—
Ralph Fadum
North Carolina State University

Vice-President of District 5—
Wade Stinson
University of Kansas

Vice-President of District 7—
Louis A. Myers
University of Arizona

Vice-President at Large—

Richard Koenig
Valparaiso University

Members-at-Large—

William Exum
Kentucky State College
Walter Hass
University of Chicago
David Swank
University of Oklahoma

I move the election of these nominees.

[Mr. Cross assumed the chair.]

Chairman Cross: The President has asked me to take the chair. You have heard the report of your Nominating Committee. The nominations are before you. Are there any additional nominations?

[The motion was regularly made and seconded that the nominations be closed.]

Is there a motion to cast the unanimous ballot for the nominees?

[The motion was regularly made and seconded that the unanimous ballot be cast for the nominees; motion carried.]

The motion carried unanimously. Congratulations on your election for the second year to a tough job. [Applause]

[President Ramer resumed the chair.]

President Ramer: Gentlemen, I know the other members nominated, including our Secretary-Treasurer, Sam Barnes, join me in expressing appreciation for this provision for yet another opportunity to serve the Association. I know I speak in behalf of all of those in pledging to you our desire to serve as best we can for the coming year.

I want to commend you for your patience and long suffering today. I don't know that I can recall when we have had this large a number persisting down to the last minute for a number of years. I know we have been facing intricate problems, difficult problems. I know that part of the difficulty comes not from opposition to some of the proposals perhaps as much as what I like to think of as impending uncertainty. In any event, I know that impending uncertainty is a strain for those of us who attempt to sit at this table.

On behalf of our officers and on behalf of all the members of our Association, I would like once again to express appreciation to Walter Byers and his colleagues in the executive office. Those of us who know most about that pattern of operation want you to know of our great respect for it. We are in a position almost on a day to day basis to see its operation and commend it to you, and wish for Walter and his colleagues continued success in that administrative operation.

If there are no other matters to come before this convention, the Chair will entertain a motion for adjournment.

[Upon motion regularly made, seconded and carried, the convention adjourned at 4:50 p.m.]

Appendix A

66th ANNUAL CONVENTION PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

[NOTE: In the following proposed amendments, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words which appear in **bold** face are to be added. All amendments shall be effective August 1, 1972, unless otherwise indicated. All page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1971-72 NCAA Manual.]

ADVERTISING

No. 1. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(e), page 7, as follows:

"(e) A student-athlete shall not *permit* or accept any remuneration for or *permit* the use of his name or picture to *directly* advertise, recommend or promote, *directly or indirectly*, the sale or use of a commercial product or service of any kind, and he shall not receive remuneration for endorsing a commercial product or service through his use of such product or service."

Source: University of Tennessee, Knoxville; District of Columbia Teachers College.

Intent: To permit use of an athlete's name or picture in limited promotional circumstances, provided he does not receive remuneration, and provided further that he does not directly endorse the product.

FINANCIAL AID

No. 2. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(f), page 8, as follows:

"(f) . . . the following practices shall constitute 'pay' for participation in intercollegiate athletics and are expressly prohibited:

"(2) Gradation or cancellation of institutional aid during the period of its award on the basis of (i) a student-athlete's ability or his contribution to a team's success, (ii) because of an injury which prevents the recipient from participating in athletics, or (iii) for any other athletic reason, *except that such*

"Aid may be gradated or cancelled if the recipient (i) renders himself ineligible for intercollegiate competition; or (ii) fraudulently misrepresents any information on his application, letter-of-intent or tender; or (iii) engages in serious misconduct warranting substantial disciplinary penalty; or (iv) **voluntarily withdraws from a sport for his own personal reasons**. Any such gradation or cancellation of aid is permissible only if such action is taken for proper cause by the regular disciplinary or scholarship awards authorities of the institution and the student-athlete has had an opportunity for a hearing. Under (iv) above, such gradation or cancellation of aid **may not occur prior to the conclusion of that academic year**."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To permit an institution to gradate or cancel financial aid at the end of the academic year if the student-athlete voluntarily withdraws from the sport.

AWARDS

No. 3. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(7)-(ii), page 10, as follows:

"(ii) Awards for special events such as postseason football games, NCAA meets and tournaments and featured individual competition may be presented only by the management of such an event and an institution which has had or will have a team participate in such event. All awards must be properly personalized. Multiple awards are permissible for special events, but the value of any and all awards received by any one competitor may not exceed \$100."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit an institution to present awards to its team members provided the over-all cost ceiling is observed.

UNDERGRADUATE ELIGIBILITY

No. 4. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(c), page 11, as follows:

"(c) He is maintaining satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate or equivalent degree as determined by the regulations of that institution."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require a student-athlete to be an undergraduate to be eligible.

POSTGRADUATE ELIGIBILITY

No. 5. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(c), page 11, as follows:

"(c) He is maintaining satisfactory progress toward a degree as determined by the regulations of that institution except that a student-athlete enrolled in the graduate or professional school of the institution he attended as an undergraduate may participate in intercollegiate athletics provided he has athletic eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within four years after initial enrollment."

Source: NCAA Council (Long Range Planning Committee).

Intent: To permit participation by graduate students under the conditions specified.

FIVE-YEAR RULE

No. 6. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(a), page 14, as follows:

"An institution shall not permit a student-athlete to represent it in intercollegiate athletic competition unless he meets the following requirements of eligibility:

"(a) He must complete his seasons of participation within five calendar years from the beginning of the semester or quarter in which he first registered at a collegiate institution, time spent in the armed services, on official church missions or with recognized foreign aid services of the U.S. Government being excepted. The

Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to this paragraph on behalf of student-athletes of the national service academies who have exhausted eligibility in one sport, but wish to compete in another sport or sports in which they have eligibility remaining. A student-athlete may apply for an exception to this paragraph if, although in good academic standing and making normal progress toward a degree at his institution, he is forced to withdraw from college for economic reasons."

Source: Trenton State College.

Intent: To provide an exception to the five-year rule for students forced to leave college for economic reasons.

SUMMER BASKETBALL

No. 7. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(c), page 14, as follows:

"(c) He must not participate in any organized, outside basketball competition except during the permissible playing season specified in Bylaw 3, or during the period from June 15 to August 31, provided he obtains written permission from his institution's director of athletics (or the latter's official representative), and he competes on a team in a league approved by the NCAA.

"(1) For a league to be approved, it must conform to the following requirements: (i) no member team shall include on its roster more than one player with intercollegiate eligibility remaining in the sport of basketball from any one college, university or junior college; (ii) no member team shall have on its staff any person associated in any capacity with a college, university or junior college; (iii) no member team shall make any payments for play or expenses directly or indirectly to any player; (iv) all players must limit their competition to one team in one league; (v) no admission shall be charged for any game; (vi) no all-star games of any kind shall be permitted, and (vii) no postseason playoffs or tournaments shall be permitted.

"(2) Such participation in violation of this provision shall require the member institution to rule the student-athlete ineligible for intercollegiate competition in the sport of basketball. Participation by residents of Puerto Rico in the Superior Basketball League of Puerto Rico is exempted from this ruling. A student-athlete may compete in one game a year involving players from his former high school and its alumni team. The Council shall have authority to waive this provision to permit student-athletes to participate in official Pan American or Olympic tryouts and competition, or participate in other international competition approved by the Department of State of the U.S. Government and sanctioned by the Council of the Association. Request for Council sanction must be made by the institution at least 30 days prior to that competition."

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference; MacMurray College (National Association of Basketball Coaches).

Intent: To permit summer basketball competition by student-athletes on teams in leagues approved by the NCAA.

SUMMER BASKETBALL

No. 8. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(c), page 14, as follows:

"(c) **He A College Division player** must not not participate in any organized, outside basketball competition except during the permissible playing season specified in Bylaw 3, or during the period from June 15 to August 31, provided he obtains written permission from his institution's director of athletics (or the latter's official representative), and he competes on a team in a league approved by the NCAA.

"(1) For a league to be approved, it must conform to the following requirements: (i) no member team shall include on its roster more than one player with intercollegiate eligibility remaining in the sport of basketball from any one college, university or junior college; (ii) no member team shall have on its staff any person associated in any capacity with a college, university or junior college; (iii) no member team shall make any payments for play or expenses directly or indirectly to any player; (iv) all players must limit their competition to one team in one league; (v) no admission shall be charged for any game; (vi) no all-star games of any kind shall be permitted, and (vii) no postseason playoffs or tournaments shall be permitted.

"(2) Such Participation in violation of this provision shall require the member institution to rule the student-athlete ineligible for intercollegiate competition in the sport of basketball. Participation by residents of Puerto Rico in the Superior Basketball League of Puerto Rico is exempted from this ruling. A student-athlete may compete in one game a year involving players from his former high school and its alumni team. The Council shall have authority to waive this provision to permit student-athletes to participate in official Pan American or Olympic tryouts and competition, or participate in other international competition approved by the Department of State of the U.S. Government and sanctioned by the Council of the Association. Request for Council sanction must be made by the institution at least 30 days prior to the competition."

Source: University of Minnesota, Duluth.

Intent: To permit summer basketball competition by College Division student-athletes on teams in leagues approved by the NCAA.

INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

No. 9. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9, by adding a new paragraph (j), page 15, as follows:

"(j) **He shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate competition in all sports if, as a prospective student-athlete, he received an expense-paid visit in excess of the number specified in Bylaw 1-5.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To render ineligible a prospective student-athlete who receives more than five expense-paid visits to the campuses of NCAA member institutions.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHEDULE

No. 10. Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 2-(d), page 16, as follows:

"Section 2. Conditions and Obligations of Membership. The members of this Association agree:

"(d) To sponsor and conduct a representative schedule in a minimum of four intercollegiate sports, with at least one sport in every sport season."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require active member institutions to conduct representative schedules in each of the minimum four sports required.

MEMBERSHIP CLASSES

No. 11. Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 3-(a), page 16, as follows:

"(a) Active members shall consist of four-year colleges and universities and two-year upper level collegiate institutions duly elected to active membership under the provisions of the Bylaws. They shall be entitled to all the privileges of members under the Constitution, Bylaws and Executive Regulations of the Association, and all privileges incidental thereto."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To qualify institutions which offer two years of upper level collegiate work for active membership.

SPORTS CAMPS

No. 12. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1, by adding a new paragraph (d), page 27, as follows:

"(d) No member institution shall permit the use of its facilities for, nor may its employees participate in, directly or indirectly, a sports camp or clinic in which there is employed a high school athletic award winner who has finished his sophomore year in high school."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To restrict the use of summer camps for recruiting purposes.

CAMPUS VISITATIONS

No. 13. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(c), page 30, as follows:

"(c) No member institution shall permit more than two one expense-paid visits visit to its campus under the authorization of paragraphs (a) and (b). The two visits may occur in either sequence of time. A prospective student-athlete may not be provided an expense-paid visit earlier than the opening day of

classes of his senior year in high school and may be provided with only one expense-paid visit to not more than five member institutions. An institution must keep on file an affidavit signed by each prospective student-athlete, who receives an expense-paid visit, that he has not exceeded the requirements of this paragraph."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To limit the number of institutions to which a prospective student-athlete may receive an expense-paid visit, and to specify when these visits may begin.

TRANSPORTATION

No. 14. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(d)-(2), page 30, as follows:

"(2) *An individual alumnus or other friend of an No member institution may shall permit a representative of its athletic interests to transport the relatives or friends of a prospective student-athlete to visit the campus or elsewhere in his own vehicle. provided such person makes the trip himself at his own expense. Such individual may not, however, pay the commercial transportation costs of a campus visit by the relatives or friends of a prospective student-athlete."*

Source: NCAA Council (Special Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To prohibit representatives of athletic interests from transporting relatives or friends of prospective student-athletes.

ENTERTAINMENT

No. 15. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(e), page 30, as follows:

"(e) An institution, its alumni or its other friends may provide entertainment for a prospective student-athlete, his parents (or legal guardians) at the institution's campus only, in two general locations only (1) the institution's campus and (2) the prospect's home community and communities contiguous thereto. Transporting a prospective student-athlete to any other site for entertainment or any other purpose shall be a violation of paragraph (d). Further, it is not permissible to entertain other relatives or friends of a prospective student-athlete at any site. A prospective student-athlete visiting a member institution's campus shall live and take his meals as regular students normally do and his entertainment shall take place on campus. If campus facilities are not available, local commercial facilities may be used, but at a scale comparable to that of normal student life. The institution (or representatives of its athletic interests) shall not provide cash to the prospect for entertainment purposes and shall not provide an automobile for his use. No member institution may arrange for or permit excessive entertainment of any prospective student-athlete on the campus or elsewhere."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To restrict entertainment of prospective student-athletes, their relatives and friends.

OFF-CAMPUS VISITATIONS

No. 16. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5, by adding new paragraph (f) and relettering subsequent paragraphs, page 31, as follows:

"(f) A member institution's athletic staff member or other representative of its athletic interests may visit a prospective student-athlete or his relatives in their home community on only two occasions for recruiting purposes. All visitation during a calendar day shall constitute one occasion. If a prospective student-athlete has on file at the member institution a signed (by the prospect and his parents or legal guardian) declaration of his intention to enroll at that institution, then one additional visit may be made to the prospect in his home community to revalidate this intention. On any visits described in this paragraph, neither the staff member (nor any representative of the institution) may expend any funds other than necessary for his own personal expenses."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To restrict the number of visits an institution's staff member may make to a prospective student-athlete and his relatives, and to prohibit any entertainment of him (or them) during these visits.

Amendment A. Amend Proposal No. 16 as follows:

"(f) A member institution's athletic staff member or other representative of its athletic interests employee may visit a prospective student-athlete or his relatives in their home community on only two occasions for recruiting purposes. All visitation during a calendar day shall constitute one occasion. If a prospective student-athlete has on file at the member institution a signed (by the prospect and his parents or legal guardian) declaration of his intention to enroll at that institution, then one additional visit may be made to the prospect in his home community to revalidate this intention. On any visits described in this paragraph, neither the staff member, employee nor or any other representative of the institution of athletic interests may not expend any funds other than necessary for his own personal expenses."

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit representatives of athletic interests to visit a prospective student-athlete on any number of occasions, but to prohibit them from expending funds other than for their own personal expenses.

Amendment B. Amend Proposal No. 16 as follows:

"(f) A member institution's athletic staff member or other representative of its athletic interests may visit a prospective student-athlete or his relatives in their home community on only two occasions for recruiting purposes All visitation during a calendar day twenty-four hour period shall constitute one occasion. If a prospective student-athlete has on file at the member institution a signed (by the prospect and his parents or legal guardian) declaration of his intention to enroll at that institution, then one additional visit may be made to the pros-

pect in his home community to revalidate this intention. On any visits described in this paragraph, neither the staff member (nor any representative of the institution) may expend any funds other than necessary for his own personal expenses.

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To change the visitation period to a continuous twenty-four hour period which may extend over parts of two calendar days.

POSTSEASON FOOTBALL CONTESTS

No. 17. Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2, by adding a new paragraph (o), page 35, as follows:

"(o) Member institutions may participate in one or more games sponsored by another national intercollegiate athletic organization and such games need not comply with the provisions of this Section."

Source: Westminster (Pa.) College.

Intent: To waive the extra events legislation to permit NCAA member institutions holding membership in the NAIA to participate in the NAIA postseason football playoffs (involving two postseason games for the two finalists), without the games being certified.

COLLEGE ALL-STAR CONTESTS

No. 18. Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 3, by deleting paragraph (b), page 35, as follows:

"(b) The dates of a game and accompanying practice period shall be confined to vacation periods on the academic calendar, or if the game is played on a Saturday, the practice period and game competition shall not require the loss of more than one day of classes on the part of any participant."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit certified college all-star games to be played during term time.

BASKETBALL PLAYING SEASON

No. 19. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(b), page 38, as follows:

"(b) Preseason practice in basketball shall not begin prior to October 15 of each year; the first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition shall not be played prior to December 1 the last Friday in November [except as provided in paragraph (d) below]; the last contest (game or scrimmage) shall not be played after the National Collegiate Basketball Championship; except that informal practice scrimmages with outside competition may be permitted prior to December 1 the last Friday in November provided they are conducted in privacy without publicity or official scoring and, provided further, that such scrimmages shall be counted against the permissible number of contests. The maximum number of contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition shall not exceed twenty-six, exclusive of con-

tests in one postseason tournament. No postseason tournament contest shall be played after the National Collegiate Basketball Championship. In the event November 30 falls on a Friday or Saturday, the first contest (game or scrimmage) of that year may be played on that date."

Source: MacMurray College (National Association of Basketball Coaches).

Intent: To permit the permissible playing season to commence on the last Friday in November.

BASKETBALL PLAYING SEASON

No. 20. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(b), page 65, as follows:

"(b) Preseason practice in basketball shall not begin prior to October 15 of each year; the first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition shall not be played prior to December 1 [except as provided in paragraph (d) below]; the last contest game or scrimmage shall not be played after the National Collegiate Basketball Championship; except that, informal practice scrimmages with outside competition may be permitted prior to December 1 provided they are conducted in privacy without publicity or official scoring and, provided further, that such scrimmages shall be counted against the permissible number of contests. The maximum number of contests (games or scrimmages), with outside competition during such period shall not exceed twenty-six exclusive of contests in one postseason tournament, which may be conducted with outside competition during such period shall not exceed twenty-eight, and no more than twenty-six of this number may be scheduled games. No postseason tournament contest shall be played after the National Collegiate Basketball Championship. In the event November 30 falls on a Friday or Saturday, the first contest (game or scrimmage) of that year may be played on that date."

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference; MacMurray College (National Association of Basketball Coaches).

Intent: To permit two outside scrimmages in addition to a 26-game schedule.

INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

No. 21. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1, page 40, as follows:

"Section 1. Individual Eligibility. Any participant in a National Collegiate Athletic Association event must be certified by his institution as satisfying *meet* all of the following requirements for eligibility, except that a participant in an NCAA-sponsored College Division event is granted certain exceptions under Section 2."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To formalize the customary practice of member institutions in certifying the eligibility of their student-athletes to participate in an NCAA event.

INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

No. 22. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(a), page 41, as follows:

"(a) He must be eligible under the rules of his institution as well as the rules of the intercollegiate athletic conference of which his institution is a member, if such affiliation is held, or, if his institution is not a member of any conference, under the rules of his own institution."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require a student-athlete competing in an NCAA event to be eligible under his institution's rules as well as those of his conference.

INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

No. 23. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(b), page 41, as follows:

"(b) He must be eligible to represent his institution in intercollegiate athletic competition under all of the applicable provisions of the Constitution and Bylaws."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify the requirements for eligibility to participate in NCAA events.

FRESHMAN RULE

No. 24. Bylaws: Amend Article 4 as follows:

1. Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d), page 41, as follows:

"(d) For the purposes of eligibility in football and basketball, he must have completed a full freshman year of two full semesters or three full quarters or one academic year as defined by the certifying institution; or He must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution after transfer from another collegiate institution, except that this provision shall not apply if he predicted a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national prediction tables at the time of his graduation from high school and meets one or more of the following requirements: (i) he is a graduate of a junior college; or (ii) he presents a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college; or (iii) he presents a minimum of twenty-four semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.500."

2. Amend Article 4, Section 1-(f)-(3), page 42, as follows:

"(f) He must not previously have engaged in three seasons of varsity competition after his freshman year, it being understood that:

"(3) Freshmen are not eligible for varsity competition in football and basketball; they are eligible for varsity competition in all other sports. Participation by a freshman on the varsity football or basketball team of a junior college shall not be counted as one of

the three four permissible seasons of varsity competition. (Freshmen are not eligible for NCAA-sponsored events in football or basketball unless they qualify under Section 2 of this Article.)"

3. Amend Article 4, page 44, by deleting Section 2, as follows:

"Section 2. College Division Exception. Freshmen may compete in all College Division events provided they are otherwise eligible. They also shall be eligible for three additional seasons of varsity competition."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference, Western Athletic Conference, Hofstra University.

Intent: To render freshmen eligible for competition in all NCAA events.

TRANSFER RULE

No. 25. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d), page 41, as follows:

"(d) For the purposes of eligibility in football and basketball, he must have completed a full freshman year of two full semesters or three full quarters or one academic year as defined by the certifying institution; or he must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution after transfer from another collegiate institution, except that this provision shall not apply if he predicted a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national prediction tables at the time of his graduation from high school and meets one or more of the following requirements: (i) he is a graduate of a junior college; or (ii) he presents a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college; or (iii) he presents a minimum of twenty-four semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.500 he has completed a minimum of three full semesters or four full quarters at a junior college, and he presents a minimum of forty-two semester hours or a minimum of fifty-six quarter hours of transferable degree credit from the junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600, the definition of transferable degree credit being left to the certifying institution."

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Intent: To permit junior college transfers to be immediately eligible for NCAA events provided they have completed three semesters or four quarters at a junior college, and present a minimum of 42 semester or 56 quarter hours of transferable degree credit.

TRANSFER RULE

No. 26. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d), page 41, as follows:

"(d) For the purposes of eligibility in football and basketball, he must have completed a full freshman year of two full semesters or three full quarters or one academic year as defined by the certifying institution; or he must have completed one full year of two full

semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution after transfer from another collegiate institution, except that this provision shall not apply if he predicted a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national prediction tables at the time of his graduation from high school and meets one or more of the following requirements: (i) he is a graduate of a junior college; or (ii) he presents a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600; or (iii) he presents a minimum of twenty-four semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.500."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require a transfer student to have an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600 to be immediately eligible.

TRANSFER RULE

No. 27. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(e), page 42, as follows:

"(e) A student-athlete who did not predict a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national prediction tables at the time of his graduation from high school must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution after transfer from another collegiate institution, except that this provision shall not apply if: (i) he is a graduate of a junior college; or (ii) he presents a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600 and has spent at least two academic years in residence at a junior college, excluding summer sessions."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600 for the sub-predictor who transfers from junior college after two academic years.

ALIEN STUDENT-ATHLETES

No. 28. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(f)-(2), page 42, as follows:

"(f) He must not previously have engaged in three seasons of varsity competition after his freshman year, it being understood that:

"(2) Participation as an individual or as a representative of any team whatever in a foreign country by an alien student-athlete (see O.I. 100) in each twelve-month period after his nineteenth eighteenth birthday and prior to his matriculation at a member institution shall count as one year of varsity competition, except that he may complete the season in his sport which, on his eighteenth birthday, is in progress and ends with the national championship contest. Loss of eligibility shall not apply to those alien students whose matriculation was not solicited by a member of

the athletic department or by a representative of its athletic interests and whose admission and financial aid have been granted by the member institution without regard, in any degree, to his athletic ability."

Source: University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.

Intent: To lower the age under which recruited alien student-athletes may compete outside of the United States without loss of eligibility, and to exempt from this Bylaw those who were not recruited or are receiving financial aid not related to their athletic ability.

INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

No. 29. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(g), page 42, as follows:

"(g) He must not have received or satisfied the requirements for a baccalaureate or equivalent degree, except that a student who is eligible during the term in which he completes his work for the degree remains eligible for any NCAA event that begins within thirty sixty days after he completes the requirements for the degree."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To extend the period during which a student-athlete may compete in an NCAA event following completion of the requirements for a baccalaureate degree.

WAIVERS

No. 30. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 3, page 44, as follows:

"Section 3. Waivers. There shall be no waiver by the Association of any of the provisions of Section 1 or Section 2 in the case of any individual student or students, except as follows:

"(a) The Eligibility Committee may waive any of the provisions of Section 1 in the case of any participant in the Pan American, or Olympic or World University Games who may, by reason of such participation, lose the right to compete in any National Collegiate Championship event.

"(b) In times of national emergency and during Pan American, or Olympic or World University Games years, the Council may waive any of the provisions of Section 1."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit the same waiver procedures in connection with the World University Games as are now available relative to the Pan American and Olympic Games.

WAIVERS

No. 31. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 3, by adding a new paragraph (e), page 45, as follows:

"(e) The Council may, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, waive the residence requirements set forth in Section 1 for a student-athlete who transfers to a member institution after loss of eligibility due to involvement in a violation of

Constitution 3-1-(f) or Bylaw 4-6-(b). The Council may waive these requirements only upon a determination of the innocent or inadvertent involvement of the student-athlete in the violation."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide a procedure whereby an ineligible student-athlete may transfer to another member institution and become immediately eligible for NCAA events.

1.600 RULE

No. 32. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6, by deletion of paragraphs (b) and (c) and all applicable interpretations, pages 46-48.

Source: Queens College.

Intent: To abolish the 1.600 legislation.

1.600 RULE

No. 33. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b), page 46, as follows:

"(b) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet unless the institution in the conduct of all its intercollegiate athletic programs:

"(1) Limits its scholarship or grant-in-aid awards and any other institutionally-administered or arranged financial assistance (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree), and eligibility for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions during the first year in residence to student-athletes who have a predicted minimum grade point average of at least 1.600 (based on a maximum of 4.000) as determined by the Association's national prediction tables or Association-approved conference or institutional tables, except that an institution may provide financial aid to a student whose matriculation was not solicited by a member of the athletic department or by a representative of its athletic interests (see O.I. 100) and whose admission and financial aid have been granted without regard in any degree to his athletic ability; such a student shall not be eligible for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions unless he satisfies the requirements of paragraph (2) and there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty athletic representative, the admissions officer and the chairman of the financial aid committee that this exception applies; and

"(2) Limits its subsequent scholarship and grant-in-aid awards and any other institutionally-administered or arranged financial assistance (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) and eligibility for competition in varsity intercollegiate athletics to student-athletes who have a grade point average, either accumulative or for the previous academic year, of at least 1.600; except that the performance requirements of this paragraph shall not apply to a student-athlete who predicted at least 1.600 upon entrance into an institution which uses the Association's national prediction tables or more demanding institutional or conference predictive formulae in applying paragraph (1). As to such a stu-

dent-athlete, he shall be limited only by the official institutional regulation governing normal progress toward a degree for all students, as well as any other applicable institutional eligibility rules, including those of the athletic conference of which the institution is a member. These institutional conference standards shall be filed in the office of the Association.

"(3) Limits its initial scholarship and grant-in-aid awards and any other institutionally-administered or arranged financial assistance (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) and eligibility for participation in athletics or organized practice sessions during the first year of residence of student-athletes transferring from another collegiate institution to those who meet the requirements outlined in paragraph (2) above, except that a student-athlete who transfers from a junior college and who failed to predict 1.600 on the Association's national prediction tables must: (i) be a graduate of the junior college; or (ii) present a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit, and have spent a minimum of two academic years in residence at the junior college, excluding summer sessions."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify application of the 1.600 rule.

1.600 RULE

No. 34. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b)-(3), page 46, as follows:

"(b) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet unless the institution in the conduct of all its intercollegiate athletic programs:

"(3) Limits its initial scholarship and grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) and eligibility for participation in athletics or organized practice sessions during the first year of residence of student-athletes transferring from another collegiate institution to those who meet the requirements outlined in paragraph (2) above, except that a student-athlete who transfers from a junior college and who failed to predict 1.600 on the Association's national prediction tables must: (i) be a graduate of the junior college; or (ii) present a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600 and have spent a minimum of two academic years in residence at the junior college, excluding summer sessions."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require a transfer student to have an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600 to qualify under the 1.600 legislation.

1.600 RULE

No. 35. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6, by adding a new paragraph (c) and relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(c) Institutions which conform to the requirements of paragraph (b) shall maintain a file which contains certification that each eligible student-athlete meets the minimum requirements of paragraph (b) and such file shall be available for examination upon request."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require institutions in compliance with the 1.600 legislation to maintain a file certifying that each eligible student-athlete meets the minimum requirements.

TRANSFERS OF MEMBERSHIP

No. 36. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 4, page 51, as follows:

"Section 4. Transfer of Membership. The following transfer of active members from their regular geographic districts is hereby made in accordance with Constitution 5-4:

"(d) From District 3 to District 6

Alcorn A&M College, Lorman, Mississippi
Centenary College, Shreveport, Louisiana
Grambling College, Grambling, Louisiana
Jackson State College, Jackson, Mississippi
Louisiana Polytechnic University, Ruston, Louisiana
Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana

"(g) From District 6 to District 5

New Mexico State University, Las Cruces
North Texas State University, Denton
West Texas State University, Canyon

"(h) From District 6 to District 7

New Mexico, University of, Albuquerque
New Mexico State University, Las Cruces
Texas, University of, El Paso"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To transfer district memberships as indicated.

TRANSFERS OF MEMBERSHIP

No. 37. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 4, page 51 as follows:

"Section 4. Transfer of Membership. The following transfer of active members from their regular geographic districts is hereby made in accordance with Constitution 5-4:

"(b) From District 3 to District 2

American University, Washington, D. C.
District of Columbia Teachers College, Washington, D. C.

George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia
Howard University, Washington, D. C.
Maryland, Univ. of, Eastern Shore, Princess Anne
Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland
U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland

"(d) From District 3 to District 8

Alcorn A&M College, Lorman, Mississippi
Centenary College Shreveport, Louisiana
Grambling College, Grambling, Louisiana
Jackson State College, Jackson, Mississippi
McNeese State University, Lake Charles, Louisiana
Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana"

Note: The above amendment was not included in the Official Notice mailed to all member institutions on December 1, 1971; however, because of the nature of the amendment, the parliamentarian has ruled that it may be considered by the Convention upon the unanimous consent of the delegates.

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To transfer district memberships as indicated.

COMMITTEES

No. 38. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 2-(d), page 54, as follows:

"(d) The Baseball Statistics and Classification Committee shall contain at least one representative from each consist of the following: a representative of the Collegiate Baseball Writers Association; the chairman of the Public Relations Committee; a representative of the Baseball Rules and Tournament Committee; a representative of the College Baseball Committee; the NCAA public relations director, and the director of National Collegiate Sports Services, who shall serve as chairman *ex officio*. The NCAA executive director, or his representative, shall be chairman *ex officio*. The Committee shall classify member institutions as either major or College Division for statistical reporting purposes and shall determine the method and categories for national rankings of baseball statistics."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify who shall be chairman, and to add the NCAA public relations director to the Committee.

COMMITTEES

No. 39. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 2-(e), page 55, as follows:

"(e) The Basketball Statistics and Classification Committee shall contain at least one representative from each consist of the following: two representatives to be chosen by the U. S. Basketball Writers Association; the chairman of the Public Relations Committee; a representative of the University Basketball Tournament Committee; a representative of the College Basketball Tournament Committee; the NCAA public relations director, and the director of National Collegiate Sports Services, who shall serve as chairman *ex officio*. The NCAA executive director, or his representative, shall be chairman *ex officio*. The Committee shall classify member institutions as either major or College Division for statistical reporting purposes and shall determine the method and categories for national rankings of basketball statistics."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify who shall be chairman, and to add the NCAA public relations director to the committee.

COMMITTEES

No. 40. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 2-(j), page 55, as follows:

"(j) The Football Statistics and Classification Committee shall contain at least one representative from each consist of the following: three representatives from to be chosen by the Football Writers Association of America; a representative of the Television Committee; the chairman of the Public Relations Committee; a representative of the College Football Committee; the NCAA public relations director, and the director of National Collegiate Sports Services, who shall serve as chairman *ex officio*. The NCAA executive director, or his representative, shall be chairman *ex officio*. The Committee shall classify member institutions as either major or College Division for statistical reporting purposes and shall determine the method and categories for national rankings of football statistics."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify who shall be chairman, and to add the NCAA public relations director to the Committee.

COMMITTEES

No. 41. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 2-(p), page 56, as follows:

"(p) The Olympic International Relations Committee shall consist of ten nine members, appointed for an Olympiad. The members also shall serve as the Association's representatives on the U.S. Olympic Committee Board of Directors.

"(1) One member shall be appointed from each of the eight geographic districts with one member at-large. The NCAA executive director, or his representative, shall be an *ex officio* member.

"(2) Members may not serve for more than two Olympiads. Members appointed to fill vacancies shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of that Olympiad. Members who serve more than one-half term in such instances shall be considered to have served a full term.

"(3) The Committee shall be responsible for the planning and direction of the Association's Olympic activities over-all policy in international relations, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee. It shall coordinate and give direction to the membership's interests and activities in the various sports federations of which the NCAA is a member, the U. S. Collegiate Sports Council and the U.S. Olympic Committee. It shall keep the membership informed through reports submitted annually or more frequently, if required to the annual Convention."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To broaden the activities and responsibilities of the current NCAA Olympic Committee.

COMMITTEES

No. 42. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 3-(e), page 59, as follows:

"(e) The Soccer Rules and Tournament Committee shall consist of six nine members. One member shall represent junior college soccer interests and one member shall represent secondary school interests. The chairman may designate a secretary-rules editor from among the membership of the Committee."

Note: The above amendment was not included in the Official Notice mailed to all member institutions on December 1, 1971; however, because of the nature of the amendment, the parliamentarian has ruled that it may be considered by the Convention upon the unanimous consent of the delegates.

Source: NCAA Executive Committee (Soccer Rules and Tournament Committee).

Intent: To expand the membership of the Soccer Rules and Tournament Committee.

66th ANNUAL CONVENTION REVIEW OF INTERPRETATIONS

[NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, the following interpretations were approved by the Council during 1971. Those letters and words which are to be deleted appear in *italics* and those letters and words which are to be added appear in **bold** face. All page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1971-72 NCAA Manual.]

ALL-STAR TEAMS

No. 43. **Constitution:** Amend O.I. 3, page 6, as follows:

"O.I. 3. A professional team shall be any team which is a member of or affiliated with a recognized professional sports organization, or any organized team which includes among its playing personnel any athlete who currently is under contract to a team which is a member of or affiliated with a professional organization in that sport, or any organized team on which there is an athlete receiving payment of any kind for his participation other than actual and necessary expenses for game trips.

An all-star team organized for, and engaging in, only one contest shall not be considered a professional team if one or more team members are under current contract to a professional sports organization; provided none of the team members receives compensation for the contest.

An all-star team composed of college seniors who are academically eligible to participate shall not be considered a professional team even though one or more team members is under contract to a professional sports organization, provided none of the team members receives compensation for the contest."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit a qualified all-star team to compete in more than one contest, even though a contract professional is a member.

ICE HOCKEY ELIGIBILITY

No. 44. **Constitution:** Amend O.I. 5, page 7, as follows:

"O.I. 5. Any student-athlete who has participated as a member of the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association's major junior A hockey classification shall not be eligible for intercollegiate athletics.

O.I. 5. Any student who has participated in more than three games after January 10 of any hockey season in the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association's major junior A classification, shall not be eligible for intercollegiate athletics."

Source: Michigan Technological University; University of Denver; University of Minnesota, Duluth; University of Michigan; University of North Dakota.

Intent: To avoid designating as professionals students who have participated in the major junior A classification on a tryout basis.

ADVERTISING

No. 45. **Constitution:** Amend O.I. 7, page 7, as follows:

"O.I. 7. It is permissible for a student-athlete's picture or the group picture of an institution's football athletic squad to appear on a calendar which is distributed as in an advertisement for of a particular business, commercial product or service, but there shall be provided there is no indication that the squad members, individually or collectively, or the institution endorse the product or the service of the calendar sponsor advertiser."

Source: University of Tennessee, Knoxville; District of Columbia Teachers College.

Intent: To clarify the use of a student-athlete's picture in the advertisement of a commercial product or service, provided he does not endorse same.

OFFICIATING

No. 46. **Constitution:** Amend O.I. 11, page 11, as follows:

"O.I. 11. A student-athlete may be employed or permitted to officiate in the intramural sports program of his institution, and he may be permitted to officiate games or contests in which the players are not above the junior high school or *ninth twelfth* grade level. In neither case shall his compensation exceed the going rate for such employment or officiating, nor shall it exceed the permissible, maximum amount of financial aid described in Constitution 3-4. He shall not officiate for compensation in any other form of athletic contests outside his institution."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit student-athletes to officiate in games in which players are above the ninth grade, but not the twelfth grade level.

ORGANIZED BASKETBALL COMPETITION

No. 47. **Constitution:** Add a new O.I. 16 following Article 3, Section 9-(c), page 14, as follows:

"O.I. 16. Outside basketball competition shall be considered 'organized' if any of the following conditions exist: Teams are regularly formed or team rosters are predetermined; competition is scheduled and publicized in advance; official score is kept; individual or team statistics are recorded; team or league standings are maintained; official timer or game officials are used; squad members are dressed in team uniforms; admission is charged; or a team is privately or commercially sponsored. Further, competition which is either directly or indirectly sponsored, promoted or administered by an individual, an organization or any other agency shall be considered organized."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To formalize the definition of organized, outside basketball competition.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHEDULE

No. 48. **Constitution:** Add a new O.I. 17, page 16, as follows:

"O.I. 17. If an institution sponsors the same sport in two different seasons, it may count the sport only in the season in which it participates in the most contests."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify when a sport, sponsored on different occasions during the academic year, may be counted in meeting the four-sport requirement of C 4-2-(d).

REPRESENTATIVE OF ATHLETIC INTERESTS

No. 49. **Bylaws:** Amend O.I. 101, page 27, as follows:

"O.I. 101. If an institution's staff member requests an alumnus or other friend of the institution to recruit a particular prospect, or has knowledge that the alumnus or friend is recruiting the prospect, then said alumnus or friend becomes a 'representative of athletic interests' of that institution. Once a person is identified as a representative, he retains that identity."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To clarify the status of representatives of athletic interests.

TRYOUT RULE

No. 50. **Bylaws:** Amend O.I. 101, page 29, as follows:

"O.I. 110. The phrase 'prospective student-athletes' shall include any prospect not registered in the institution at the time of the practice or test therein described; except that during *preseason practice in fall sports or during practice occurring in mid-year between terms on the academic calendar*, it shall be permissible for a student-athlete who is not registered, but who has been accepted for admission to the institution, to engage in such *preseason practice activity* provided said practice is not used to determine whether aid is to be awarded."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit entering student-athletes to participate in practice sessions between mid-year terms on the academic calendar.

COACHING SCHOOLS

No. 51. **Bylaws:** Amend O.I. 112, page 29, as follows:

"O.I. 112. No member of an institution's coaching staff may conduct or participate in any coaching school involving *prospective students, i.e., one who is eligible for admission to college or who has started classes for his senior year in high school students who have finished classes in the spring after their junior year in high school.*"

Source: Southern Conference (Collegiate Commissioners Association).

Intent: To restrict further the participation of coaches in clinics involving high school students.

ENTERTAINMENT

No. 52. **Bylaws:** Amend O.I. 122, page 32, as follows:

"O.I. 122. A prospective student-athlete may visit a member institution's campus at his own expense as often as he wishes. During such visits, the institution may not pay any expense or provide any entertainment except a maximum of *two three complimentary admissions to a campus athletic event*. Payment of any expenses or providing any entertainment, except as noted, on such a trip shall constitute an expense-paid trip."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To increase the number of complimentary tickets which may be provided.

VISITATIONS

No. 53. **Bylaws:** Amend O.I. 123, page 32, as follows:

"O.I. 123. The limitation on total visits set forth in Bylaw 1-5-(c) applies separately to the period in which the prospective student-athlete is in high school and to the period beginning with his enrollment in a college preparatory school or junior college. Once a prospect enrolls in a college preparatory school or junior college, he may visit two member institutions one time each at the expense of the institutions."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To limit a prospect to two additional expense-paid visits to member institutions following enrollment in a preparatory school or junior college.

TRANSFER RULE

No. 54. **Bylaws:** Add a new O.I. 129, page 33, as follows:

"O.I. 129. Freshmen (plebes) entering the official summer enrollment program of one of the four national service academies (i.e., United States Air Force, Coast Guard, Military and Naval Academies) shall be considered student-athletes of a senior collegiate institution for purposes of Bylaw 1-7, but shall not be considered transfer students (insofar as NCAA legislation is concerned) if at the conclusion of said summer program they enroll in another collegiate institution."

Source: U. S. Coast Guard Academy, U. S. Military Academy, U. S. Naval Academy, U. S. Air Force Academy.

Intent: To remove from the athletic recruitment process, but exempt from the transfer rule freshmen entering the summer enrollment program of one of the four national service academies.

FOOTBALL OPEN DATES

No. 55. **Bylaws:** Amend O.I. 202, page 35, as follows:

"O.I. 202. An open date refers to a regular weekend playing date prior to the end of an institution's regular football schedule on which an institution is not playing a game, or to a date ap-

proved by a two-thirds majority of those Council members present and voting to enable an institution to assist financially in meeting an unforeseen hardship situation resulting directly from the institution's intercollegiate athletic activities."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit an institution which has scheduled less than 11 games to add a game at the end of its regular season to assist financially in meeting an unforeseen hardship directly related to its intercollegiate athletic program.

FOOTBALL SEASON

No. 56. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 300, page 37, as follows:

"O.I. 300. The 'traditional fall season' is the period from the second Friday in September 1 through the second Saturday in December."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To lengthen the period during which member institutions may schedule intercollegiate football games.

POSTSEASON BASKETBALL TOURNAMENTS

No. 57. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 307, page 39, as follows:

"O.I. 307. A 'postseason tournament' contest in basketball is one between teams that are not identified until the close of the preceding regular season, the term 'postseason' necessarily implying that the time of the event shall be after a regular season. If a conference or playing league conducts a regularly scheduled, season-end, elimination tournament among some or all of its members to determine its entry in the NCAA Tournament, then the game or games played by each team shall count as one of the permissible twenty-six regular season contests and the tournament shall not be considered postseason. Institutions which tie for a conference championship may participate in a single-elimination playoff to determine the conference's automatic entry in an NCAA tournament without the game or games being counted as a regular season contest or postseason tournament."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify the application of the basketball playing season limitations to season-end conference tournaments and playoffs.

TRANSFER RULE

No. 58. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 400-(b), by adding a new paragraph (6) and renumbering subsequent paragraphs, pages 42-43, as follows:

"(b) He shall not be considered a transfer:

"(6) If the Eligibility Committee of the Association concludes that he changed institutions in order to continue participation in his sport because his original institution dropped the sport from its intercollegiate program;"

Source: Kent State University.

Intent: To make a student immediately eligible for NCAA events if he

transferred because his original institution no longer sponsored his sport on an intercollegiate basis.

TRANSFER RULE

No. 59. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 400-(b) by adding a new paragraph (8), page 43, as follows:

"(b) He shall not be considered a transfer:

"(8) After having been out of college for at least eighteen months, provided he was in good academic standing and making normal progress toward a degree at the time he first withdrew from college, and provided further that he was forced to withdraw for economic reasons."

Source: Trenton State College.

Intent: To provide an exception to the transfer rule for NCAA events for students forced to leave college for economic reasons.

TRANSFER RULE

No. 60. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 401, page 43, as follows:

"O.I. 401. In the administration of the forty-eight twenty-four semester hours or seventy-two thirty-six quarter hours of transferable degree credit, all grades earned by a student in courses which would be transferable to the certifying institution must be included in determining whether the student has earned a 2.500 average. All grades earned in courses which are not transferable to the certifying institution, irrespective of the grade earned, shall not be included in determining whether the student has earned a 2.500 average."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To conform the interpretation to the requirements of Bylaw 4-1.

1.600 RULE

No. 61. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 409, page 47, as follows:

"O.I. 409. Only the actual cumulative rank-in-class or grade point average at the end of the sixth, seventh or eighth semester in high school may be used as recorded on an official high school transcript (or other official form) sent directly by the high school to the admission office of the college. If a high school graduate attends a college preparatory school for a full academic year, he may be judged by his predicted grade point average as a high school graduate or on the basis of his college preparatory record. It is not permissible to round a student's prediction regardless of the number of digits to which the computation is carried, e.g., a prediction of 1.59999 would not qualify a prospective student-athlete under the provisions of Bylaw 4-6-(b)."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To expressly prohibit rounding of a prospect's prediction.

1.600 GED TESTS

No. 62. Bylaws: Add a new O.I. 410, renumbering subsequent O.I.'s, page 47, as follows:

"O.I. 410. A student-athlete who did not graduate from high school, but subsequently completes the General Education Development (GED) test and obtains a state high school equivalency diploma, may establish his prediction through use of his high school record (see O.I. 409), or through use of the Association-approved table which converts the average of his five GED scores to high school rank."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To describe the use of the GED test to establish prediction.

1.600 RESIDUAL TESTS

No. 63. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 411, page 47, as follows:

"O.I. 411. If a student's prediction of a student-athlete (per O.I. 100) has not been established and he reports for practice or competition, the student he shall be required to take the ACT or SAT test on the first subsequent national test date, and the institution shall be required to determine his prediction within two weeks following the receipt of scores from such test. Until his prediction is determined, the student-athlete may engage in practice, but not participate in competition. If he then predicts 1.600 or better, he is eligible to continue practice and represent the institution in competition in accordance with other applicable institutional, conference and NCAA policies.

If a student (not already a student-athlete per O.I. 100) reports for practice or competition, he may establish immediate temporary eligibility for competition by establishing *prima facie* an adequate prediction (1.600 or better) through taking a locally administered ACT or SAT test at his own expense; his continuing eligibility shall be dependent upon taking the ACT or SAT test on the first subsequent national test date, from which the institution shall be required to determine his prediction within two weeks following receipt of scores from such test, and thereafter his eligibility shall depend upon whether he predicts 1.600 or better. The institution may pay the cost of such second (nationally administered) test."

Source: University of Washington.

Intent: To establish a temporary prediction for a non-O.I. 100 student.

1.600 PREDICTION FORMULAE

No. 64. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 413, page 47, as follows:

"O.I. 413. The Association's national prediction tables shall be reviewed and brought up to date every five years; institutional and conference tables, every three years. In the development of the formulae for institutional and conference tables, the proportional contribution of high school record (rank-in-class or grade point average) and test score cannot vary more than 60-40 per cent."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements).

Intent: To limit weighting of test scores and high school record in development of 1.600 prediction tables.

1.600 FINANCIAL AID

No. 65. Bylaws: Add a new O.I. 417, page 48, as follows:

"O.I. 417. Financial assistance, as the term is used in Bylaw 4-6-(b), includes all institutional funds such as scholarships, grants, loans, work-study program assistance, on-campus employment and aid from government or private sources for which the institution is responsible for selecting the recipient or determining the amount of aid, or providing matching or supplementary funds for a previously determined recipient; further, it includes off-campus employment earnings and other sources of aid for which the athletic interests of the institution intercede in behalf of the student-athlete."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To define the types of financial assistance to which the 1.600 rule applies, and to guard against circumvention of the rule.

1.600 RULE

No. 66. Bylaws: Add a new O.I. 418, page 48, as follows:

"O.I. 418. A student-athlete who practices or participates while ineligible under the provisions of Bylaw 4-6-(b) shall be charged with the loss of one year of practice and varsity eligibility for each year gained improperly, which shall be the next year the student is in attendance. A student-athlete who receives financial aid while ineligible for such aid under Bylaw 4-6-(b) shall be declared permanently ineligible for practice, intercollegiate athletics and such financial aid. The institution may appeal to the Council for a reduction of the eligibility in either instance. The loss of eligibility shall apply only at the institution involved in the violation."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To formalize the existing practice as it effects a student-athlete who participates, practices or receives financial aid while not eligible under the 1.600 legislation.

ADMINISTRATION OF AID

No. 67. Constitution: The following interpretation relating to Article 3, Section 4-(a), page 12, was printed in the October 1, 1971, issue of the *NCAA News*. The member indicated has asked that it be reviewed by the 66th Convention:

"**Situation:** An outside source wishes to donate funds to an institution to finance a grant-in-aid or scholarship which is to be earmarked for an athlete or a particular sport.

"**Question:** Is this permissible?

"**Answer:** No. Earmarking of funds from an outside source for a scholarship or grant-in-aid for an individual or a particular sport restricts the administration of aid by the institution. [C 3-4-(a)]

Appellant: Big Ten Conference.

66th ANNUAL CONVENTION OTHER REVISIONS AND PROPOSALS

(The following revisions and proposals were approved by the Council or Executive Committee during 1971. Those letters and words which have been deleted appear in *italics* and those letters and words which have been added appear in **bold face**. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1971-72 NCAA Manual.)

INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

No. 68. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 2, by adding a new paragraph (e), page 65, as follows:

"(e) When an ineligible student-athlete participates in an NCAA championship event, the institution's share of net receipts from such event in excess of the regular expense reimbursement shall be withheld by the NCAA executive director, or if said funds have been distributed, the institution shall be required to return its share."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To withhold distribution of net receipts of an NCAA event from an institution which uses an ineligible player in that event.

ADVERTISING

No. 69. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 16, page 72, as follows:

"Section 16. Advertising. Association policy governing acceptable advertisers and advertising copy for game programs, broadcasts and telecasts of NCAA championship events excludes the following: alcoholic beverages (except malt beverages), political organizations, feminine hygiene products and professional sports organizations or personnel. Malt beverage advertising may be used without restriction in game programs consistent with the policy of the host institution; however, only one two such commercials may be used in a broadcast or telecast, and it each must be preceded by an announcement indicating origination of the program is returning to the station's broadcasting studio."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee (University Basketball Tournament Committee).

Intent: To permit one additional malt beverage commercial on broadcasts or telecasts of NCAA events.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

No. 70. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 3, Section 2, by adding a new paragraph (c) and relettering subsequent paragraphs, page 73, as follows:

"(c) When an Association committee or the Council holds more than one reimbursed meeting during a fiscal year, one of the meetings shall be held in the Kansas City metropolitan area."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To reduce the Association's meeting expenses by requiring certain committees to meet in the area of the NCAA headquarters.

APPROVED EXTRA EVENTS

No. 71. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 4, Section 1-(b), page 73, as follows:

"(b) The gross receipts shall be all revenues derived from the game including sale of tickets (less applicable taxes **except those paid as stadium use taxes for stadium rental or in lieu thereof), concessions, programs, radio rights, television rights, movie rights and any other income derived from the operation of the game. Any complimentary tickets shall be accounted for at face value and shall become a part of the gross receipts."**

Source: NCAA Executive Committee (Extra Events Committee).

Intent: To prohibit sponsors of postseason football games from deducting stadium use taxes from gross receipts.

ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURE

No. 72. Enforcement Procedure. Amend Section 7, page 82, as follows:

"Section 7. When the NCAA Council finds that there has been a violation of the Constitution 3-1, 3-3, 3-4 or 3-9 or Bylaws affecting the eligibility of an individual student-athlete or student-athletes, the institution involved and its conference (if the institution holds such affiliation with an allied member) shall be notified of the violation and the name(s) of the student-athlete(s) involved, it being understood that if the institution (or its conference) fails to take appropriate action, the involved institution shall be cited to show cause under the Association's regular enforcement procedures why it should not be disciplined for failure to do so. It is understood that if an institution or its conference concludes that enforcement continued application of the rule(s) would work an injustice on any student-athlete, an appeal shall be submitted to the Council and promptly acted upon by that body or a sub-committee designated by it."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify procedures under Section 7 and provide for a sub-committee to hear individual eligibility appeals if the Council determines this is feasible and desirable.

FINANCIAL AID PROPOSALS

No. 73. Resolution: At its meeting of October 25-27, 1971, the NCAA Council voted to present the following resolution to the 66th annual Convention:

"Be It Resolved, that the National Collegiate Athletic Association hold a special convention prior to July 1, 1972, to consider the adoption of legislation to:

"Require athletically-related scholarships or grants-in-aid to be awarded on the basis of the recipient's need;

"Place limitations upon the number of athletically-related scholarships and grants-in-aid which may be awarded by a member institution;

"Inaugurate a candidate's declaration program;

"Limit financial aid awards to a period of one year, and

"Consider other proposals related to the foregoing items."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Financial Aid).

Intent: To determine if a special convention should be called to consider the several recommendations of the Special Committee on Financial Aid which have been approved in principle by the Council.

NATIONAL COLLEGE DIVISION SOCCER CHAMPIONSHIP

No. 74. Resolution: At its meeting of August 17-18, 1971, the NCAA Executive Committee voted to present the following resolution to the 66th annual Convention:

"Be It Resolved, that a pilot National College Division Soccer Championship be conducted under the jurisdiction of the Soccer Rules and Tournament Committee during the fall of 1972, and

"Be It Further Resolved, that not more than twenty-four teams be invited to participate, with the understanding that the National Collegiate Championship field may be reduced to sixteen teams, and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that the provisions of Bylaw 4-6-(a) shall apply in determining the eligibility of member institutions to compete in the National College Division Championship."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee (Soccer Rules and Tournament Committee).

Intent: To establish a National College Division Soccer Championship on a trial basis.

BASKETBALL TELEVISION

No. 75. Resolution: The NCAA Television Committee recommends adoption of the following resolution by the 66th annual Convention:

"Whereas, a marked increase has occurred in regional and national television of college basketball games during the regular season;

"Whereas, there are reports of significant damage from such telecasts to the in-person attendance at school and college games;

"Whereas, similar attendance damage in football has been reduced by a program of controlled television;

"Whereas, 20,300 high schools, 630 junior colleges and 1,014 senior colleges conduct basketball programs from the first part of November to the end of March and it is in the best interests of the schools and colleges to minimize television conflict with their respective contests;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the 66th Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association directs the Association's Television Committee to conduct studies of basketball

scheduling and telecasting practices and, if in its opinion the facts warrant, to prepare a plan for controlled basketball television for presentation to the membership in a mail referendum, approval of such a plan to be achieved only by a favorable two-thirds majority vote of those eligible members voting;

"Be It Finally Resolved, that such a program shall recognize the role of the traditional regional Saturday afternoon television programs of college basketball which to date have resulted in minimal conflict with other school and college games."

Source: NCAA Council (NCAA Television Committee).

Intent: To authorize a survey of scheduling and telecasting practices by the Television Committee to determine if a plan for controlling basketball telecasts should be formulated.

SPECIAL CONVENTION

No. 76. Resolution: At its meeting of January 5, 1972, the NCAA Council voted to present the following resolution to the 66th annual Convention:

"Be It Resolved, that the National Collegiate Athletic Association hold a special convention prior to July 1, 1972, to consider the adoption of legislation to:

"Reorganize the Association's legislative structure including, but not limited to, separation of the membership into divisions and adoption of separate Bylaws for each division;

"Require athletically related scholarships or grants-in-aid to be awarded on the basis of the recipients' need;

"Place limitations upon the number of athletically related scholarships and grants-in-aid which may be awarded by a member institution;

"Inaugurate a candidate's declaration program;

"Limit financial aid awards to a period of one year, and

"Consider other matters related to the foregoing."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To determine if a special convention should be called to consider the several proposals of the Special Committees on Legislative Reorganization and Financial Aid, as recommended by the Association's Council.

SPECIAL CONVENTION

No. 77. Resolution: At its meeting of January 5, 1972, the NCAA Council voted to present the following resolution to the 66th annual Convention:

"Be It Resolved, that the National Collegiate Athletic Association hold a special convention prior to July 1, 1972, to consider the adoption of legislation to:

"Reorganize the Association's legislative structure including,

but not limited to, separation of the membership into divisions and adoption of separate Bylaws for each division, and
"Consider other matters related to the foregoing."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To determine if a special convention should be called to consider the proposals of the Special Committee on Legislative Re-organization, as recommended by the Association's Council.

Appendix B

66th ANNUAL CONVENTION

AMENDMENTS TO AMENDMENTS

NOTE: In the following proposed amendments to amendments, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All page numbers listed refer to preceding pages containing proposals to be considered by the Convention.

POSTGRADUATE ELIGIBILITY

Amendment C. Amend Proposal No. 5, page A-2, as follows:

"(c) He is maintaining satisfactory progress toward a degree as determined by the regulations of that institution except that a student-athlete who ~~has received his baccalaureate or equivalent degree and who is enrolled in the graduate or professional school of the institution he attended as an undergraduate~~ may participate in intercollegiate athletics provided he has athletic eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within four years after initial enrollment in a **collegiate institution**."

Source: NCAA Council.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHEDULE

Amendment D. Amend Proposal No. 10, page A-5, as follows:

"Section 2. Conditions and Obligations of Membership. The members of this Association agree:

"(d) To sponsor and conduct a representative schedule in a minimum of four intercollegiate sports, according to the **level of intercollegiate competition of a conference or an individual institution**, with at least one sport in every sport season."

Source: West Coast Athletic Conference.

CAMPUS VISITATIONS

Amendment E. Amend Proposal No. 13, page A-5, as follows:

"(c) No member institution shall permit more than **one two** expense-paid visit visits to its campus under the authorization of paragraphs (a) and (b). A prospective student-athlete may not be provided an expense-paid visit earlier than the opening day of classes of his senior year in high school and may be provided with only **one two** expense-paid visit visits to not more than five member institutions. An institution must keep on file an affidavit signed by each prospective student-athlete, who receives an expense-paid visit, that he has not exceeded the requirements of this paragraph."

Source: Big Eight Conference.

OFF-CAMPUS VISITATIONS

Amendment F. Amend Proposal No. 53, page A-23, as follows:

"O.I. 123. The limitation on total visits set forth in Bylaw

1-5-(c) applies to the period in which the prospective student-athlete is in high school. Once a prospect enrolls in a college preparatory school or junior college he may visit two five member institutions one time each at the expense of the institutions."

Source: Big Eight Conference.

1.600 RULE

Amendment G. Amend Proposal No. 66, page A-27, as follows:

"O.I. 418. A student-athlete who practices or participates while ineligible under the provisions of Bylaw 4-6-(b) shall be charged with the loss of one year of practice and varsity eligibility by his institution for each year gained improperly, which shall be the next year the student is in attendance. A student-athlete who receives financial aid while ineligible for such aid under Bylaw 4-6-(b) shall be declared permanently ineligible for practice, intercollegiate athletics and such financial aid by his institution. The institution may appeal to the Council for a reduction of the ineligibility in either instance. The loss of eligibility shall apply only at the institution involved in the violation."

Source: NCAA Council.

ADMINISTRATION OF AID

Amendment H. Withdraw Proposal No. 67, page A-27, and amend O.I. 15 as follows:

"O.I. 15. Financial assistance is 'administered by' an institution if the institution, through its regular committee or other agency for the awarding of financial aid to students generally, has the final determination of the student-athlete who is to receive the award and its value. This prohibits a donor from contributing funds to an institution to finance a scholarship or grant-in-aid for a particular student-athlete. A donor may contribute funds for a particular sport, but the decision as to how such funds are to be allocated in the sport must rest exclusively with the institution."

Source: NCAA Council.

INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Amendment I. Amend Proposal No. 68, page A-28, as follows:

"(e) When an ineligible student-athlete participates in an NCAA championship event and he or the institution knew or had reason to know of his ineligibility, the institution's share of net receipts from such event in excess of the regular expense reimbursement shall be withheld by the NCAA executive director, or if said funds have been distributed, the institution shall be required to return its share."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Amendment J. Amend Proposal No. 70, page A-28, as follows:

"(c) When an Association committee or the Council holds more than one reimbursed meeting during a fiscal year, one of the

meetings shall be held in the Kansas City metropolitan area. The executive director, for good reason, may authorize exceptions to this paragraph."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

1.600 FINANCIAL AID

Amendment K. Amend Proposal No. 65, page A-27, as follows:

"O.I. 417. Financial assistance, as the term is used in Bylaw 4-6-(b), includes all institutional funds such as scholarships, grants, loans, work-study program assistance, on-campus employment and aid from government or private sources for which the institution is responsible for selecting the recipient or determining the amount of aid, or providing matching or supplementary funds for a previously determined recipient; further, it includes off-campus employment earnings and all other sources of aid, except bonafide earnings from off-campus employment, for which the athletic interests of the institution intercede in behalf of the student-athlete."

Source: Big Eight Conference.

1.600 RULE

Amendment L. Add a new O.I. 419, as follows:

"O.I. 419. The phrase, 'for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree,' as set forth in Bylaw Article 4, Section 6-(b)-(1), does not include an award of scholarships, grants, loans, work-study program assistance, on-campus employment and aid from government or private sources to a student-athlete given under the following conditions established in writing and certified by the faculty athletic representative, the admissions officer and the chairman of the financial aid committee of the institution:

"(a) The program awarding institutional aid is completely independent of the athletic interests of that institution and the program in awarding institutional aid applies written criteria which base selection upon factors unrelated to ability to participate in intercollegiate athletic competition, and

"(b) The award of institutional aid to the particular recipient was based upon the written criteria unrelated to his athletic ability and that the selection of the recipient was not influenced by the intercollegiate athletic interests of the institution. Any intervention by the athletic intercollegiate interests of the institution to bring about an award of institutional aid other than merely notifying the student-athlete of the existence of the program awarding institutional aid, shall constitute adequate proof of influence unless the contrary is clearly established by the institution."

Source: Big Ten Conference.

ALIEN STUDENT-ATHLETES

Amendment M. Amend Proposal No. 28, page A-12, as follows:

"(f) He must not previously have engaged in three seasons of

varsity competition after his freshman year, it being understood that:

"(2) Participation as an individual or as a representative of any team whatever in a foreign country by an alien student-athlete (see O.I. 100) in each twelve-month period after his eighteenth birthday and prior to his matriculation at a member institution shall count as one year of varsity competition, except that *he may complete the season in his sport which, on his eighteenth birthday, is in progress and ends with the national championship contest, except that he may participate throughout the seasons in sports which are in progress or begin during the school year in which he reaches his eighteenth birthday.* Loss of eligibility shall not apply to those alien students whose matriculation was not solicited by a member of the athletic department or by a representative of its athletic interests and whose admission and financial aid have been granted by the member institution without regard, in any degree, to his athletic ability."

Source: University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.

INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

Amendment N. Amend Proposal No. 29, page A-13, as follows:

"(g) He must not have received or satisfied the requirements for a baccalaureate or equivalent degree (or he must not have completed his eligibility for participation as a graduate student under the provisions of Article 3, Section 3-(c) of the Constitution) except that a student who is eligible during the term in which he completes his work for the degree (or his graduate eligibility as referred to above) remains eligible for any NCAA event that begins within sixty days after he completes the requirements for the degree (or his graduate eligibility)."

Source: NCAA Council.

REPRESENTATIVE OF ATHLETIC INTERESTS

Amendment O. Amend Proposal No. 49, page A-22, as follows:

"O.I. 101. If an institution's staff member requests an alumnus or other friend of the institution to recruit a particular prospect, or has knowledge that the alumnus or friend is recruiting the prospect, then said alumnus or friend becomes a 'representative of athletic interests' of that institution. Once a person is identified as a representative, it is presumed he retains that identity."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

VISITATIONS

Amendment P. Amend Proposal No. 53, page A-23, as follows:

"O.I. 123. The limitation of total visits set forth in Bylaw 1-5-(c) applies to the period in which the prospective student-athlete is in *high school the twelfth grade of school*. Once a prospect enrolls in a college preparatory school or junior college, he may visit two member institutions one time each at the expense of the institution."

Source: NCAA Council.

OFF-CAMPUS VISITATIONS

Amendment Q. Amend Proposal No. 16, page A-7, as follows:

"(f) A member institution's athletic staff member or other representative of its athletic interests may not visit a prospective student-athlete or his relatives in *their home community at any location other than the institution's campus on only more than two occasions for recruiting purposes.* All visitation during a calendar day shall constitute one occasion. If a prospective student-athlete has on file at the member institution a signed (by the prospect and his parents or legal guardian) declaration of his intention to enroll at that institution, then one additional visit may be made to the prospect in *his home community to revalidate this intention.* On any visits described in this paragraph, neither the staff member (nor any representative of the institution) may expend any funds other than necessary for his own personal expenses."

Source: NCAA Council.

BASKETBALL TELEVISION

Amendment R. Amend Proposal No. 75, page A-30, as follows:

"Whereas, a marked increase has occurred in regional and national television of college basketball games during the regular season;

"Whereas, there are reports of significant damage from such telecasts to the in-person attendance at school and college games;

"Whereas, 20,300 high schools, 630 junior colleges and 1,014 senior colleges conduct basketball programs from the first part of November to the end of March and it is in the best interests of the schools and colleges to minimize television conflict with their respective contests;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the 66th Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association directs the Association's Television Committee to conduct studies of basketball scheduling and telecast practices and, if in its opinion the facts warrant, to prepare a plan for controlled basketball television for presentation to the membership in a mail referendum, approval of such a plan to be achieved only by a favorable two-thirds majority vote of those eligible members voting to the Council for determination whether it should be proposed to the membership for adoption by mail vote of not less than two-thirds of those voting in such referendum;

"Be It Finally Resolved, that such a program shall recognize the role of the traditional regional Saturday afternoon television programs of college basketball which to date have resulted in minimal conflict with other school and college games."

Source: NCAA Council.

Appendix C

66th ANNUAL CONVENTION

Nominating Committee

Chairman—Alan J. Chapman

District 1—Harry Arlanson, Tufts University
District 2—Ernest C. Casale, Temple University
District 3—William Exum, Kentucky State College
District 4—John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University
District 5—Arthur W. Nebel, University of Missouri, Columbia
District 6—Alan J. Chapman, Rice University
District 7—James R. Jack, University of Utah
District 8—George F. Ilg, Fresno State College
At-Large—Walter D. Bryant, University of the South
At-Large—Harvey C. Chrouser, Wheaton College
At-Large—Raymond J. Whispell, Muhlenberg College

Committee on Committees

Chairman—Lloyd P. Jordan

District 1—Karl Kurth Jr., Trinity College
District 2—Robert H. Frailey, American University
District 3—William M. Bell, Fayetteville State University
District 4—James C. Loveless, DePauw University
District 5—Floyd Gass, Oklahoma State University
District 6—Harold Jeskey, Southern Methodist University
District 7—George C. McCarty, University of Texas, El Paso
District 8—Kenneth Karr, San Diego State College
At-Large—Thomas A. Cartmill, Saint Lawrence University
At-Large—Joseph T. Hoy, Western Michigan University
At-Large—Lloyd P. Jordan, Southern Conference

Committee on Voting

Chairman—Albert W. Twitchell

District 1—Harold S. Westerman, University of Maine, Orono
District 2—Robert K. Faris, George Washington University
District 3—John R. Bell, East Tennessee State University
District 4—Thomas J. Frericks, Dayton University
District 5—Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
District 6—Ulysses S. Jones Sr., Southern University
District 7—George C. McCarty, University of Texas, El Paso
District 8—George F. Ilg, Fresno State College
At-Large—Albert W. Twitchell, Rutgers University

Committee on Memorial Resolutions

Chairman—John J. Horgan

C. D. Henry, Grambling College
John J. Horgan, Seton Hall University
Edwin P. Horner, Baylor University

Committee on Credentials

Chairman—J. Lewis Comer

Carl Abner, University of Louisville
J. Lewis Comer, California State College, Long Beach
Kenneth N. Vickery, Clemson University

Parliamentarian

Harry M. Cross, University of Washington

Chairman of Business Sessions

Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Chairmen of Round Tables

Samuel E. Barnes, District of Columbia Teachers College
Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University

Appendix D

Past and Present Officers of the NCAA

President

1906-1913	Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy
1914-1916	LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
1917-1929	Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy
1930-1932	Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
1933-1937	Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1938-1940	William B. Owens, Stanford University
1941-1944	Philip O. Badger, New York University
1945-1946	Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming
1947-1949	Karl E. Leib, University of Iowa
1950-1952	Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
1953-1954	Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama
1955-1956	Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College
1957-1958	Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
1959-1960	Herbert J. Dorricott, Western Colorado State College
1961-1962	Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
1963-1964	Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
1965-1966	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1967-1968	Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
1969-1970	Harry M. Cross, University of Washington
1971-1972	Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee

Secretary-Treasurer

*1906-1908	Louis A. Bevier, Jr., Rutgers University
*1908	William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia
1909-1939	Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
1940-1944	Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1945-1951	Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference
1952-1954	Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska
1955-1956	Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
1957-1958	Edwin D. Mouzon, Jr., Southern Methodist University
1959-1960	Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
1961-1962	Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
1963-1964	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1965-1966	Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
1967-1968	Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
1969-1970	William J. Flynn, Boston College
1971-1972	Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, District of Columbia Teachers College

*Bever served as secretary, Lambeth as treasurer, in 1908.

Appendix E

NCAA Convention Sites, 1944-1973

(Hotels in parentheses.)

*38th	1944	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)
41st	1947	New York City (New Yorker)
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (Saint Francis)
44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)
46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971	Houston (Astroworld)
66th	1972	Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)

*NOTE: Prior to 1944, the annual Convention was held in December. No meeting was held in 1943 and commencing with 1944 the Convention has been held in January.

1973 Convention

Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois, January 11-13

1974 Convention

Saint Francis Hotel, San Francisco, California, January 7-9

NATL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOC



1NCAA00003106N

